A

REVIEW

OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

EUCHARIST,

As laid down in

Scripture and Antiquity.

By DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D.
Chaplain in ordinary to his MAJESTY.

Ut autem *Literam* ſequi, & *Signa* pro *Rebus* quæ iis ſignificantur accipere, ſervilis Infirmitatis eſt; ita *inutiliter* Signa interpretari, male vagantis erroris eſt.
Auguſtin. de Doctrin. Chriſtian. L. III. c. 9. p. 49.

The SECOND EDITION corrected.

LONDON:

Printed for W. INNYS and R. MANBY at the Weſt End of St. *Paul*'s, and CORN. CROWNFIELD at *Cambridge*.

MDCCXXXVII.

ERRATA.

Page 40. line ult. for *Lud.* read *Lugd.*
45. line 26. read *familiarly.*
123. line 23. read *Appropriation.*
126. in notis, line 10. διὰ.
134. line ult. προσλαμβάνειν.
152. in not. line 5. υἱῶ.
186. line 29. read *membrum esse illius.*
244. line 24. read ὅπ.
319. line 34. read *divinitùs.*
479. line 29. read *Sacrificia.*
484. in not. line 2. πᾶσιν.
513. line ult. read 38.
539. in not. line 5. τῶν.
556. line 13. *duty.*
570. line 8. *about.*

A TABLE of

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

CHAP. II.

CHAP. III.

CHAP. IV.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

CHAP. X.

CHAP. XI.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN Page 184 I have followed the common Opinion of learned Proteſtants (Mr. *Bingham*, Dr. *Wall*, &c.) in relation to *Infant-Communion*, as prevailing in the Vth Century, under a Notion of its ſtrict *Neceſſity*, built upon *John* vi. 53. Tho' I had ſome Scruple about it; as may appear by my manner of expreſſing myſelf, and by the Reference to *Thorndike* at the Bottom.

HAVING ſince looked ſomewhat deeper into That Queſtion, I think it now juſt to my Readers, to advertiſe them, that I apprehend That *Common Opinion* to be a *Miſtake*; and that tho' the Practice of giving Communion to *Children* at *ten* or at *ſeven* Years of Age (or ſomewhat ſooner) was *ancient*, and perhaps *general*, yet the Practice of communicating *mere Infants*, under a Notion of its *Neceſſity*, and as built upon *John* vi, came not in before the VIIIth or IXth Century, never was *general*; or however laſted not long in the *Weſt*, where it firſt began. My Reaſons for this Perſuaſion are too long to give here: But I thought this ſhort Hint might be proper, to prevent Miſ-conceptions as to That Article.

THE

THE INTRODUCTION.

MY Deſign in this Work is to treat of the Sacrament of the *Holy Communion*, according to the Light which Scripture and right Reaſon afford, making uſe of ſuch Helps and Means for the interpreting Scripture, as God's good Providence, in former or later Ages, has furniſhed us with. The Subject is of very great Weight in itſelf, and of near Concern to every Chriſtian; and " therefore ought to be ſtudied with a Care " proportioned to the Importance of it: That " ſo we may govern both our ſelves and our " People aright, in a Matter of ſuch Conſe- " quence; avoiding with great Caution the " Extremes on both Hands, both of exceſſive " *Superſtition* on one Hand, and of *profane Neg-* " *lect* on the other. We are now viſibly un- " der the Extreme of *Neglect*; and therefore " we ought to ſtudy by all Means poſſible to " inſpire our People with a *juſt Reſpect* for " this Holy Inſtitution, and to animate them " to deſire earneſtly to partake often of it; " and in order to that, to prepare themſelves " ſeriouſly, to ſet about it with *Reverence* and " *Devotion*, and with thoſe *Holy Purpoſes*, and

" *ſolemn Vows*, that ought to accompany it *.

But before I enter upon the Main Subject, it may not be improper here to throw in ſome *previous* Conſiderations, in order to prepare my Readers for what they will find in this Treatiſe, that they may the more eaſily form a true and ſound Judgment of the Subject-Matter of it.

I. The firſt Conſideration is, that Scripture alone is our complete *Rule of Faith and Manners*, " containing all Things neceſſary to Sal-
" vation, ſo that whatſoever is not read there-
" in, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be
" required of any Man, that it ſhould be be-
" lieved as an Article of Faith, or be thought
" requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation †.

Whatever Scripture contains, either *in expreſs Words* rightly underſtood, or *by Conſequence* juſtly deduced, is *Scripture-Doctrine*, and ought to be Religiouſly believed and obeyed; allowing only for the different Degrees of *Importance* belonging to different Scripture-Truths, or Scripture-Precepts.

II. For the right underſtanding of Scripture, it is of great Moment to know what the moſt *eminent* Writers, or Teachers, ancient and modern, have thought before us on the ſame Subject; and more eſpecially to obſerve what they unanimouſly *agreed in*. For, as they had the ſame *Scriptures* before them, and the ſame *common Reaſon* to direct them, and uſed as much *Care* and *Diligence*, and were bleſſed with as

* Bp. *Burnet* on Article 31*ſt*. p. 355.
† Article the VIth.

great *Integrity* as any of us now can juſtly pretend to, their Judgment is not to be ſlighted, nor their Inſtructions to be deſpiſed. The *Reſponſa Prudentum*, the *Reports*, *Precedents*, and *adjudged Caſes* are allowed to be of conſiderable Weight for determining Points of *Law*: And why ſhould they not be of like Weight, ordinarily, for the determining Points of *Theology*? Human Law there, and Divine Law here, is properly the authentick Rule of *Action*: But the *common Reaſon* of Mankind is properly the Rule of *Interpretation* in both Caſes: And that common Reaſon ſhines out the brighteſt, and appears in greateſt Perfection, in the *united* Verdict of the wiſeſt and moſt excellent Men. It is much eaſier for *one*, or for ſome *few* fallible Interpreters to be deceived, than for *many*, other Circumſtances ſuppoſed equal. Nothing leſs than very *clear Scripture*, or as *clear Reaſon*, ought to weigh any Thing againſt the concurring Sentiments of the *Chriſtian World*: And even in ſuch a Caſe, ſome fair Account ought to be given, how it came to paſs, that ſuch *clear Scripture*, or *clear Reaſon* had hitherto eſcaped the Notice, or miſſed of the Acceptance of the wiſeſt and beſt of Men.

A VERY judicious Writer of our own has obſerved, that "variety of Judgments and "Opinions argueth *Obſcurity* in thoſe Things "whereabout they differ; but that which all "Parts receive for Truth, that which, every "one having ſifted, is by no one denied, or "doubted of, muſt needs be matter of *infal-*

" *lible* Certainty *. This He applies to the *general* Doctrine of the Holy Communion, as being " *inſtrumentally* a Cauſe of the real Par-
" ticipation of Chriſt, and of Life in his Body
" and Bloud †. And it is of this that He ſays,
" that all Sides at length, for ought He could
" ſee, were come to a general Agreement :
" All approve and acknowledge to be moſt
" true, as having nothing in it but that which
" the Words of Chriſt are on all Sides con-
" feſſed to inforce; nothing but that which
" the Church of God hath always thought
" neceſſary; nothing but that which alone
" is ſufficient for every Chriſtian Man to
" believe concerning the *Uſe* and *Force* of
" this Sacrament: Finally, nothing but that
" wherewith the Writings of all *Antiquity*
" are conſonant, and all Chriſtian *Confeſ-*
" *ſions* agreeable ‡. Thus wrote that excellent Perſon, in the Year 1597. The *Zwinglians* by that Time had corrected, or more clearly explained their Principles: And *Socinus* was ſcarce yet known on this Side the Water, or had made no Figure with reſpect to this Subject, or none worth the mentioning, in oppoſition to a Preſcription of 1500 Years before Him, and to the united Voice of all the Churches in his Time. It is a Maxim of Prudence, as in all other Matters, ſo alſo in the interpreting Scripture, to *conſult with the wiſe*,

* *Hooker* B. V. p. 310.
† Compare p. 306. ‡ P. 306.

and

and to take to our Aſſiſtance the moſt *eminent Lights* we can any where find, either among Ancients or Moderns. To be a little more particular, I may here obſerve ſomething diſtinctly of each.

1. As to *Ancients*, ſome lived in the very Infancy of the Church, had perſonally known our Bleſſed Lord in the Fleſh, or converſed with the Apoſtles, and afterwards governed their reſpective Churches, as venerable Biſhops, many Years, often adminiſtring the Holy Communion and at length dying Martyrs. Is it at all likely, that ſuch Men as they were, ſhould not underſtand the true Scripture Doctrine concerning the *Sacraments*, or that they ſhould affect to delude the People committed to their Charge, with *Superſtitious* Conceits, or fond Expectations? A Man muſt be of a very odd Turn of Mind, who can deliberately entertain ſo unworthy a Thought of the *Apoſtolical* Fathers, or can preſume to imagine that He ſees deeper into the *Uſe* or *Force* of thoſe ſacred Inſtitutions than thoſe Holy Men did. It is reaſonable to conceive, that the New Teſtament was penned with a very particular View to the Capacities of the *firſt* Readers, or Hearers; not only becauſe it was natural to adapt the Style to the then current Language and Cuſtoms, but alſo becauſe much depended upon making the Goſpel plain and intelligible to the firſt Converts, above all that ſhould come after. If the earlieſt Chriſtians, after the Apoſtles, could not readily underſtand the Religion then taught,

how ſhould it be handed down with Advantage to others of later Times? But if the Scripture-Doctrine ſhould be ſuppoſed comparatively *obſcure* to thoſe that come *after*, yet ſo long as the *earlier* Chriſtians found it perfectly *clear*, and left behind them uſeful Memoirs whereby we may learn how they underſtood it, there will be ſufficient Security againſt any dangerous Miſtakes in ſucceeding Ages, by looking back to the Senſe of the moſt early Interpreters. Great Regard therefore ought to be paid to the known Senſe and Judgment of the *Apoſtolical* Fathers*. The later Fathers, of the Second, Third, and Fourth Centuries, have their Weight alſo, in Proportion to their known Integrity, and Abilities, and Fame in all the Churches; and more eſpecially in Proportion to their *early* ſtanding, their Nearneſs to the *Fountain Head* †.

2. As to *Moderns* of beſt Note, they agree with the Ancients in the main Things, and may be uſefully conſulted on the preſent Subject. Some of them have been eminently ſkilled in *Jewiſh Antiquities*, and others in *Eccleſiaſtical*. Some have excelled in *Criticiſm* and the *learned* Languages: Others in *Clearneſs* of Conception, and *Accuracy* of Judgment: All are uſeful in their ſeveral Ways, and may ſug-

* Of this ſee more in ABp. *Wake*'s Apoſtolical Fathers. Introd. Ch. X.

† This Argument is conſidered at large in my *Importance*. Ch. VII. p. 335——466.

geſt

geſt many Things which upon due Enquiry will be found to be right, and which no ſingle Writer, left to Himſelf, and without conſulting them, would ever have thought on. A Man that affects to think by Himſelf, will often fancy He ſees that in Scripture, which is not there, and will overlook what there really is: He will run wide in his Conjectures, criticize in a wrong Place, and fall ſhort in moſt Things, for want of Compaſs, and larger Views, or for want of a due Conſideration of Conſequences here, or there. Truth is of wide Extent, and is all over uniform, and conſiſtent: And it may require *many Eyes* to look out, and ſearch round, that every Poſition advanced may agree with all Truths, natural and revealed, and that no heterogeneous Mixture be admitted to deform and deface the whole Syſtem. How often does it happen, that a Man pleaſes Himſelf with a Thought, which ſtrikes Him at firſt View, and which perhaps He looks upon as Demonſtration: And yet farther Enquiries, into other Mens Labours, may at length convince Him, that it is mere Deluſion, juſtly exploded by the more knowing and judicious. There are numberleſs Inſtances of that Kind to be met with among Men of Letters: Which ſhould make every Writer cautious how He preſumes too far upon his own unaſſiſted Abilities, and how He oppoſes his *ſingle* Judgment to the *united* Verdict of wiſe, great, and good Men. It requires commonly much Pains and Care to trace a Notion quite through; to run it

up to its firſt Principles, and again to traverſe it to its remoteſt Conſequences, and to clear it of all juſt Objections, in order to be at length rationally ſatisfied, that it is ſound and good, and *conſiſtent throughout*. Different Churches, or Parties have their different Interpretations of the ſame Texts, and their different Superſtructures built upon the ſame Principles. They have reſpectively their ſeveral Pleas, Pretences, Arguments, Solutions, for the maintaining a Debate either in the *offenſive*, or *defenſive* Way. A Subject thus comes to be narrowly ſcann'd, and minutely viewed on every Side; and ſo at length a conſiſtent Chain of Truth may be wrought out, by a careful Hand, from what the fineſt Wits, or ableſt Heads among the ſeveral contending Parties, have happily ſupplied.

But perhaps it may here be aſked; is then every Man obliged to look deep into Religious Controverſies? Are not the Scriptures alone ſufficient for any plain and ſincere Chriſtian to conduct Himſelf by, whether as to Faith or Manners? I anſwer: 1. Common Chriſtians muſt be content to underſtand Scripture as they may, under the Help of ſuch *Guides* as Providence has placed over them, and in the conſcientious Uſe of ſuch *Means* as are proper to their Circumſtances: Which is all that ordinarily can be required of them. 2. Thoſe who undertake to *direct* and *guide* them, are more particularly obliged to *ſearch* into Religious *Controverſies*, and to *prove all Things* (as far as lies in their Power) in order to lead others in the right

right Way. 3. Thoſe Guides ought, in their Enquiries, or Inſtructions, to pay a proper Regard and Deference to other Guides of eminent Note, ancient and modern, and not lightly to contradict them, or vary from them; remembring always, that themſelves are *fallible*, and that *new* Notions (in Religion eſpecially) are not comparable, generally ſpeaking, to the *old*, *proved*, and *tried*. 4. If any Man interpreting Scripture in a *new Senſe*, pretends that his Doctrine at leaſt, is *old*, being *Scripture-Doctrine*; He ſhould be told, that his Interpretation however is *new*, and very *ſuſpicious*, becauſe *new*, and ſo not likely to be *Scripture-Doctrine*. The *Novelty* of it, is itſelf a ſtrong Preſumption againſt it, and ſuch as nothing can overbalance but very *clear* and *plain* Reaſons on that Side. The Judgment of ten Thouſand Interpreters will always be of conſiderable Weight againſt the Judgment of ſome *few*, who are but *Interpreters* at beſt, and as *fallible* as any other: And it muſt argue great Conceitedneſs and Self-Sufficiency, for a Man to expect to be heard, or attended to, as a *Scripturiſt*, or a *Textuary*, in Oppoſition to the *Chriſtian World*; unleſs He firſt fairly conſiders and confutes what the ableſt Writers have pleaded for the *received* Conſtruction, and next as fairly proves and inforces his own. That there is very great Weight and Force in the united Voice of the Chriſtian World, is a Point not to be denied by any: And indeed thoſe that affect to ſet up *new* Notions, are themſelves aware of it, and tacitly,

tacitly, at leaſt, confeſs the ſame Thing. For, they value ſuch *Authorities* as they are any way able to procure, or even to torture ſo far as to make them ſpeak on their Side: And they pride themſelves highly in the *Number* of their *Diſciples* (as often as they chance to ſucceed) thinking it a great Advantage to their Cauſe, if but the *Multitude* only, or the *Vulgar Herd* approve and eſpouſe the ſame Thing with them. *Socinus*, for Inſtance, while He ſlighted, or pretended to ſlight, the concurring Judgment of all Churches, ancient and modern, yet felt a very ſenſible Pleaſure in the Applauſes of ſome *few* Individuals, whom he had been able to deceive: And He looked upon their *Approbation* as a *confirming* Circumſtance that his Sentiments were true and right. This kind of natural Logick appears to be common to our whole Species: And there are few, I believe, ſo ſanguine (unleſs diſordered) as to confide entirely in their own Judgment, or not to ſuſpect their own beſt Reaſonings, however plauſible they may at firſt appear, if they have no body elſe to concur with them, and ſupport them. Therefore again I conclude as before, that it is of great Moment to know and conſider, what *Others* have thought before us, and what the *common Reaſon* of Mankind approves: And the more numerous or the more conſiderable the Perſons were or are who ſtand againſt us in any Article, the leſs Reaſon, generally, have we to be confident of our own *private* Perſuaſions.

I SHALL

I SHALL only add, that in Subjects which have already paſſed through many Hands, and which have been thoroughly ſifted and conſidered by the ableſt and beſt Heads, in a Courſe of 1700 Years, there appears to be a great deal more Room for *Judgment*, than for *Invention*; ſince little *new* can now be thought on, that is worth Notice: And it is much wiſer and ſafer to take the moſt *valuable* Obſervations of Men moſt eminent in their ſeveral Ways, than to advance poor Things of our own, which perhaps are ſcarce worth the mentioning in Compariſon.

III. I MUST farther premiſe, in relation to our preſent Subject, that as there may be two Extremes, *viz.* of *Superſtition* on one Hand, and of *Profaneneſs* on the other, it appears to be much ſafer and better to lean towards the former Extreme, than to incline to the latter. Where there is Room for *Doubt*, it is prudent to err rather on that Side which aſcribes *too much* to the Sacrament, than on that which aſcribes *too little*. 1. Becauſe it is erring on the Side of the *Precepts*: For, Scripture gives us *expreſs* Cautions* againſt paying too little Regard to this holy Sacrament, but never cautions us at all, or however not expreſsly, againſt the contrary Extreme. 2. Beſides, ſince we attempt not, and deſire not to carry the Reſpect due to the Sacrament at all higher than the *ancient Churches*, and the primitive *Saints* and *Martyrs* have carried the ſame before, it

* 1 *Cor.* XI. 27, 29.

will

will be erring on the *humble*, *modeſt*, *pious* Side, if we ſhould happen to run into an Extreme, after ſuch bright Examples. And this again is much *ſafer* (for, who would not wiſh that his Lot may be amongſt the *Saints?)* than it can be to deviate into the contrary Extreme of *Irreverence*, and to come ſo much the nearer to the *Faithleſs* and *Unbelieving*, who have their Portion in this Life.

It may be pleaded perhaps, that a Perſon does no Harm, or riſques no Danger, by erring on the *leſſening* Side, becauſe God will certainly perform what He has really *promiſed* of the Sacraments, to every *worthy* Receiver, whether believed or no. But then the Queſtion is, how a Man can be thought a *worthy* Receiver, who, without ſufficient Grounds, *diſbelieves* the Promiſes, much more if He confidently rejects them, and teaches others alſo to do ſo. *Schlictingius* pleads in this Caſe, that the *Effect* of the Sacrament will be the ſame to every one that receives, tho' He diſbelieves the Doctrine of its being a *Mean of Grace* *, or

* Articulus de *Cœna Domini & Baptiſmo* (ſi *vera* eſt veſtra ſententia, qua cœnam Domini & Baptiſmum *Media* eſſe ſtatuitis per quæ Deus *Spirituales effectus* in Animis Hominum operetur) exprimit quidem cauſam Salutis inſtrumentalem: Sed tamen *ignoratus* aut *repudiatus* Salutem non adimit, dummodo Quiſpiam *cœna Domini & Baptiſmo* utatur; adhibitis enim iſtis divinitùs ordinatis *Inſtrumentis Effectum* ſequi neceſſe eſt.

Schlicting. adv. *Balthaſ. Meiſn.* p. 6. Conf. *Socin.* de Cœna. Tom. 1. p. 767.

To which *Abr. Calovius* well anſwers:

—Negare nos, Sacramenta *talia media* eſſe quæ illico *effectus* ſequatur, etiamſi *Fides* non accedat: *Fides* autem locum habere nequit

or the like: As if He thought that the *outward Act* of receiving were all, and that the inward Qualification of *Faith* were of no Moment. But that was his great Miſtake. They who diſbelieve and openly deny the *inward Graces* of the Sacrament, are *unworthy* Receivers for that very Reaſon, and ordinarily forfeit all Right and Title to the promiſed *Graces*.

It may be further pleaded, on the ſame Side, that the Notion of the Sacraments, as *Means of Grace* (ſuppoſing it erroneous) is apt to lead Men to rely upon the *Sacraments*, more than upon their own ſerious *Endeavours* for the leading a good Life, or to reſt in the *Sacraments* as ſufficient without keeping God's Commandments. But this is a Suggeſtion built upon no certain Grounds. For, ſuppoſe we were deceived (as we certainly are not) in our high Conceptions of the Uſe and Efficacy of this Sacrament; all that follows is, that we may be thereby led to *frequent* the Sacrament ſo much the *oftner*; to come to it with the greater *Reverence*, and to repeat our *ſolemn Vows* for the leading a good Life, by the Aſſiſtance of Divine Grace, with the more ſerious and devout Affections. No Divines amongſt us, that I know of, ever teach that the Uſe of the *outward* Sacrament is of any avail without inward *Faith* and *Repentance*, or entire *Obedience*. Our Church at leaſt, and, I think, all Proteſtant

nequit in iis qui negant & impugnant directe *media Salutis* divinitus inſtituta.

Abr. Calov. contr. Socin. Tom. 1. Part. 2. p. 251.

Churches have abundantly guarded againſt any one's reſting in the bare *outward* Work. The Danger therefore on this Side is very ſlight in Compariſon. For, what if a Man ſhould *erroneouſly* ſuppoſe that upon his *worthy* receiving He obtains *Pardon* for paſt Sins, and *Grace* to prevent future, will not this be an Encouragement to *true Repentance*, without which He can be no *worthy* Receiver, and to *Watchfulneſs* alſo for the Time to come, without which the Divine *Grace* can never have its perfect Work? Not that I would plead for any *pious Miſtake* (were it really a *Miſtake*) but I am anſwering an *Objection*; and ſhewing, that there is no *comparative* Force in it. Were the Perſuaſion I am pleading for, really an Error, Reaſon good that it ſhould be diſcarded: Religion wants not the Aſſiſtance of *pious Frauds*, neither can it be ſerved by them. But as we are now ſuppoſing it *doubtful* on which Side the *Error* lies, and are arguing only upon that *Suppoſition*, it appears to be a very clear Caſe, that Religion would ſuffer abundantly more by an Error on the *left Hand*, than by an Error on the *Right*; and that of the two Extremes, *Profaneneſs*, rather than *Superſtition*, is the dangerous Extreme.

ADD to this, that corrupt Nature generally leans to the *diminiſhing* Side, and is more apt to detract from the Burden of Religion, than to increaſe the Weight; and therefore the *ſtronger Guard* ought to be placed there. Men are but too inclinable of themſelves to take up with

with low and groveling Sentiments of *Divine* Things: And ſo there is the leſs need of bending Scripture that Way, when the Words are fairly capable of an *higher* Meaning, yea and require it alſo, as ſhall be ſhewn in the Sequel.

If it ſhould be aſked, what Temptation any ſerious Chriſtian can have to *leſſen* the *Promiſes* or *Privileges* belonging to the Sacraments? I anſwer, that pure *good Nature*, and *miſtaken Humanity* may often tempt Men to be as *eaſy* and *indulgent* as poſſible, in their *Caſuiſtry*, for the relieving of *tender Conſciences*, and for the quieting the *Scruples* of their Brethren. The Guides of Souls are ſometimes apt to be over officious that Way, and much more than is proper; like as *indulgent Parents* often ruin their Children by an exceſſive Fondneſs, conſidering their *preſent uneaſineſs*, more than their *future well-being*. When *Epicurus* ſet Himſelf to take off the *Reſtraints* of Religion, no doubt but He thought, He was doing the moſt *humane*, and the *beſt-natured* Office imaginable. It had the *Appearance* of it, in ſome Reſpects (tho' *upon the whole* it was altogether the Reverſe) and That was his chief Temptation to it. It is not improbable that the ſame Kind of *good Nature*, ill-directed, has tempted many otherwiſe learned and valuable Guides, to be too *indulgent Caſuiſts*, and to comply too far with the Humour of the World. *Strict Notions* of the Sacraments require as *ſtrict Obſervance* of the ſame Sacraments, which demands the more *intenſe Care*, and greater *Abſtraction* of Thought;

all

all which is irkſom and painful to Fleſh and Blood: There lies the Temptation to *low* and *diminiſhing* Conceptions of the Sacraments, both in Clergy and People.

But, are there not Temptations likewiſe to an over-ſcrupulous *Severity?* Undoubtedly there are. Sometimes *Education, Temper, Prejudice*; ſometimes indiſcreet *Zeal*, or a Spice of *Enthuſiaſm:* But in the general, and for the moſt part, the making Religion bend to the Humours and Faſhions of the World, is the *Sin* which moſt *eaſily beſets us*; and therefore there it is, that we ought to appoint the double Guard. To conclude this Article, all *Extremes* are wrong, and it may require ſome Care and good Diſcernment to obſerve in every Inſtance the *Golden Mean:* But ſtill there may be greater Sin and Danger on one Side, than on the other; and I have thought it of ſome Moment to determine thus briefly, to which of the Extremes we may, in our Circumſtances, moſt ſecurely and wiſely lean.

IV. There is another Conſideration very proper to be hinted here in the Entrance, relating to the Prejudice often done to our venerable Sacraments, by repreſenting them under the detracting, or diminiſhing Name of *Poſitive Duties:* As if they were to be conſidered as *Duties* only, rather than *Religious Rites* in which *God* bears a *Part*; or as if that Part which belongs to us, and is really *Duty*, were a *ſingle* Duty, and not rather a Band and Cement of all Duties, or a kind of Sponſion and Security

Security for the preſent and future Performance of the whole Duty of Man. How this Matter ſtands, will be ſeen diſtinctly in the Sequel. But it is proper to hint ſomething of it here beforehand, leſt the Reader, by attending to a falſe Light, ſhould ſet out under a Miſtake of the main Queſtion. Let it be previouſly underſtood, what it is that we aſſert and maintain, for the removing of Prejudices, and for the preventing any wrong Suſpicion, either of our exalting a bare *external* Duty above Faith, Hope, and Charity, or of our recommending any *ſingle* Duty in derogation to the reſt.

1. In the firſt Place therefore, let it be carefully noted, that it is not merely a *Duty* of ours, but a *Sacred Rite* (in which *God* Himſelf bears a *Part*) that we are labouring to exalt, or rather to do Juſtice to. The Doctrine of our Church, and of all Chriſtian Churches, early and late, is much the ſame with what our *Homilies* teach us: Namely, that *in the Sacraments, God embraces us, and offereth Himſelf to be embraced by us*; and that they *ſet out to the Eyes, and other outward Senſes, the inward workings of God's free Mercy, and ſeal in our Hearts the Promiſes of God**.

A learned Writer obſerves and proves, that a *Sacrament* relates to that which *flows from God to us*: And he adds, that *it is a Thing neither denied, nor forgotten by any, but is evident from*

* *Homily* on the Common-Prayer and Sacraments. p. 370, 371. Small Edit.

*what the Scriptures teach concerning Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper**. Indeed, the *Socinian* Way is, to exclude *God*, as it were, out of the Sacraments, and to allow Him no Part in them, but to reduce all to a bare *Human performance*, or *Poſitive Duty:* But we have not ſo learned Chriſt. We are ſo far from thinking the Sacramental Tranſaction to be a bare *Duty* of ours, that we conceive there is great Uſe and Efficacy in a Sacrament, even where the *Recipient* performs no *Duty* at all, nor is capable of any, as in the Caſe of *Infants* receiving Baptiſm. It is farther obſervable, that *Baptiſm* is frequently mention'd together with *Repentance*, in the New Teſtament, as diſtinct from it; tho' *Repentance* alone, as it ſignifies or implies *entire Obedience*, fully expreſſes all that is properly and merely *Duty* on our Part. A plain Sign that *Baptiſm*, as a *Sacrament*, carries more in the Idea of it, than the Conſideration of bare *Duty*, and that it comes not, in its whole Notion, under the Head of *Duties*, but of *Rites*, or *Contracts*, or *Covenants*, ſolemn Tranſactions between God and Man. *God* bears his Part in it, as well as we *ours:* And therefore it is looked upon as *diſtinct* from bare *Duties*, and ſpoken of accordingly.

I SUPPOSE, it might be on theſe and the

* *Towerſon* on the Sacraments. p. 12. *Voſſius*, to the ſame Purpoſe, ſays: Quemadmodum Fides eſt quaſi *manus noſtra*, qua nos quærimus & accipimus: Sic verbum & Sacramenta eſſe quaſi *manus Dei* quibus is nobis offert & confert quod a Fide nobis petitur & accipitur.

Voſſ. de Sacram. vi & effic. p. 252. Vol. VI. opp.

like Conſiderations, that ſome *Divines* have conceived, that a *Sacrament*, properly, is rather an Application of *God* to Men, than of *Men* to God. Mr. *Scandret*, diſtinguiſhing a *Sacrament*, according to its preciſe Formality, from a *Sacrifice*, obſerves, that it is *an outward viſible Sign of an inviſible Grace or Favour from God to Man* *. And Dr. *Rymer* takes Notice, that according to our Church Catechiſm, " A Sa-
" crament is not ſuppoſed, in its *moſt eſſential*
" Part, an Application made by Men to God,
" but one *made by God to Man*——A graci-
" ous Condeſcenſion of God's, by which He
" converſes with Men, and exhibits to them
" Spiritual Bleſſings, *&c.*——God's Part is in-
" deed the *whole* that is ſtrictly and properly
" *Sacramental:* The outward and viſible Signs
" exhibited, are in Effect the *Voice of God*,
" repeating his Promiſe of that Inward and
" Spiritual Favour †. Dr. *Towerſon* long before had obſerved, that there is a *Difficulty* as to *ſhewing, that a Sacrament relates equally to that which paſſeth from us to God, and that it imports our Duty, and Service* ‡. He conceived no Difficulty at all, as to *God's Part* in a Sacrament; That was a clear Point: But He thought it not ſo eaſy to prove, that the ſtrict and proper Senſe of the Word *Sacrament* includes *Man's Part* at all. However, it is very certain, that

* *Scandret*. Sacrifice of the Divine Service. p. 54.

† *Rymer*. General Repreſentation of Revealed Religion. p. 286, 287.

‡ *Towerſon* on the Sacraments. p. 12.

the whole Tranſaction, in the Caſe of *Adults*, is between two Parties, and that the Application is *mutual* between God and Man. And this muſt be acknowledged particularly in the Euchariſt, by as many as do allow of a *Conſecration-Prayer*, and do admit that Service to be part of our *Religious Worſhip*, as alſo to be a *federal* Rite. But from hence may appear, how widely they miſtake who conſider a Sacrament as a bare *human Performance*, a diſcharge of a *Poſitive Duty* on Man's Part, and nothing more, throwing out what belongs to God, and what is moſt ſtrictly *Sacramental*. It is ſinking, or dropping the nobleſt and moſt eſſential Part of the *Idea*, and preſenting us with a very lame and inſufficient Account of the *Thing*. But a more minute Explication of this Matter, together with the Proofs of what we maintain, will come in hereafter: All I intended here, was only to give the Reader ſome previous Conception of the State of the main Queſtion, that He may underſtand the more clearly what we are about.

2. NEXT, I muſt obſerve, that That Part in a Sacrament which is really *ours*, and which, ſo far as concerns Adults, is properly *Duty*, is yet ſuch a Duty as is ſuppoſed to comprehend, one way or other, *all Duty*: For, receiving *worthily* (as ſhall be ſhewn in its Place) implies preſent *Repentance*, a Heart turned to *God* and to *univerſal* Obedience, and a ſerious Reſolution ſo to abide to our Life's End. It has been thought ſomewhat ſtrange, by

thoſe who have imbibed wrong Notions of the Caſe, that *all Chriſtian Privileges* ſhould be ſuppoſed to follow a *ſingle Duty*, when they really belong to the *whole Syſtem* of Duties. But when it is conſidered, that theſe Privileges are never conceived to be annexed to this *ſingle Duty*, in any other View, or upon any other Suppoſition, but as it vertually carries in it (or in the Idea of *worthy* Reception) *all Duty*, the main Difficulty will vaniſh; for, it may ſtill be true, that thoſe Chriſtian Privileges go along with the *whole Syſtem* of Duties, and with nothing ſhort of it. We never do annex all Chriſtian Privileges to this ſingle Duty, but as this Duty is conceived, for the Time being, to *contain* all the reſt; for That we take to be implied in receiving *worthily*. Whether we are right in interpreting *worthy* Reception in ſo comprehenſive a Senſe, is not now the Queſtion, but may be conſidered in its Place: All I am concerned with here, is to ward off a Charge of *Inconſiſtency*, with reſpect to our Doctrine on this Head.

But to ſhew the Weakneſs of the Charge yet more plainly, let the ſame Objection be urged in a very common Caſe of *Oaths* to a Government, or of *Subſcription* to Articles, to which many *State-Privileges* and *Church-Privileges* are ordinarily annex'd. What, may ſome ſay, ſhall all thoſe Privileges be given, merely for the Labour of repeating an *Oath*, or of writing a *Name?* No certainly: The *outward Work* is the leaſt and the loweſt Part of what

the Privileges are intended for, if it be any Part at all, in a ſtrict Senſe. The Privileges are intended for Perſons ſo *ſwearing*, or ſo *ſubſcribing*, upon a Preſumption that ſuch *Oath* carries in it *all dutiful Allegiance* to the Sovereign, and that ſuch *Subſcription* carries in it *all Conformity* in Faith and Doctrine, to the Church eſtabliſh'd. Of the like Nature, and Uſe, are our Sacramental Ties, and Covenants. They are ſuppoſed, when *worthily* performed, to carry in them all dutiful Allegiance to God, and a firm Attachment to Chriſt; a Stipulation of a good Conſcience, and, in a Word, *univerſal Righteouſneſs*, both as to *Faith* and *Manners* *: All which is ſolemnly entred into for the *preſent*, and ſtipulated for the *future*, by every ſincere and devout Communicant. To be ſhort, *Repentance*, rightly underſtood, and a due Attendance on the *Sacraments*, taken together, do in our Account make up the *whole Syſtem* of Chriſtian Practice for the Time being: Therefore in annexing all Goſpel-Privileges to *worthy* receiving, we do not annex them to *one Duty* only, but to *all*, contained as it were, or ſumm'd up, (by the *Sup-*

* What *Tertullian* obſerves of the Sacrament of Baptiſm, is juſtly applicable to both Sacraments.

Lavacrum illud *obſignatio* eſt *Fidei*, quæ Fides a *Pœnitentiæ* Fide incipitur & commendatur. Non ideo abluimur ut *delinquere deſinamus*, ſed quia *deſiimus*, quoniam jam *corde loti* ſumus. Hæc enim prima Audientis Intinctio eſt, *metus integer*, deinde quoad Dominum ſenſeris, *Fides ſana*, *conſcientia* ſemel *pœnitentiam* amplexata. Ceterum, ſi ab Aquis peccare deſiſtimus, neceſſitate, non Sponte innocentiam induimus.

Tertull. De Pœnit. c. VI. p. 125. Rigalt.

poſition)

poſition) in That one. All the Miſtake and Miſ-conception which ſome run into on this Head, appears to be owing to their abſtracting the *outward Work* from the *inward Worthineſs* ſuppoſed to go along with it, and then calling That a *ſingle* Duty, which at beſt, is but the *Shell* of Duty in itſelf, and which, in ſome Circumſtances (as when ſeparate from a *good Heart*) is no Duty at all, but a grievous *Sin*, a *Contempt* offered to the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and highly provoking to Almighty God.

THUS far I have taken the Liberty of premiſing a few Things in the Entrance; not for the *anticipating* what I am hereafter to prove, but for the removing thoſe *Prejudices* which appeared to lie in the Way. And now I proceed, with God's Aſſiſtance, to what I intend upon the Subject of the *Euchariſt*, otherwiſe ſtiled the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, or the *Holy Communion*.

CHAP. I.

Of the moſt noted or moſt conſiderable Names, *under which the* Holy Communion *hath been* anciently *ſpoken of.*

CHAP. I.

BEFORE I come directly to treat of the *Thing*, it may be proper to obſerve ſomething of the *Names* it has anciently gone under: Which I ſhall endeavour to range in Chronological Order, according to the Time when each Name may be ſuppoſed to have come up, or firſt to have grown into vogue.

A. D. 33. *Breaking of Bread.*

THE oldeſt Name given to this Holy Ceremony, or Religious Service, ſeems to have been that of *breaking Bread*, taken from what the Diſciples ſaw done by our Lord in the ſolemnity of the *Inſtitution*. I chooſe to ſet the Date according to the Time of the firſt *clear* Inſtance [a] we have of it rather than according to the Time when St. *Luke* related it in his

[a] I ſaid, firſt *clear* Inſtance; becauſe tho' *Luke* XXIV. 30, 35. has been underſtood of the *Euchariſt* by ſome *Ancients*, and more *Moderns* (*Romaniſts* eſpecially) and I ſee no Abſurdity in the Interpretation, nor any Thing highly improbable, or that could give *juſt* Advantage to the *Romiſh* Cauſe with reſpect to *Communion in one Kind*; yet ſince it is a *diſputed* Conſtruction, and ſuch as cannot be aſcertained, I call that Inſtance not *clear*, but paſs it off as none, becauſe it is *doubtful*.

Hiſtory;

Hiſtory; becauſe very probably he followed the Style of thoſe who then celebrated it. St. *Luke* in his Hiſtory of the *Acts*, ſpeaking of the Diſciples, ſays: *They continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and Fellowſhip, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers* [b]. The Circumſtances of the Text plead ſtrongly for interpreting it of the *Holy Communion:* And the *Syriac* Verſion (which is of great Antiquity) renders it *breaking of the Euchariſt* [c]; which is ſome Confirmation of the ſame Conſtruction. A little lower, in the ſame Chapter, mention is again made of the Diſciples, as *continuing daily in the Temple, and breaking Bread from Houſe to Houſe* [d]; or rather *in a Houſe*, ſet apart for holy Uſes [e].

St. *Luke* a third Time takes Notice of the *breaking of Bread:* Where alſo the *Syriac* Verſion renders as before, *breaking of the Euchariſt.* The Circumſtances confirm it: It was on the *firſt Day of the Week*, and St. *Paul* is obſerved to have *preached unto them.* St. *Paul* alſo Him-

b *Acts* II. 42.

c The ſame Phraſe occurs in the *Recognitions.* L. VI. n. 15. *Euchariſtiam frangens* cum eis.

d *Acts* II. 46. Our Tranſlation in the Phraſe *from Houſe to Houſe* (κατ' οἶκον) follows *Beza*, who renders *Domatim*, and has been found Fault with by *Scaliger*, *Mede*, *Beveridge*, and *Cave*, referred to in *Wolfius* Cur. Crit. p. 1048. Compare *Johnſon*'s *Unbloody Sacrifice.* Vol. 2. p. 98.

e Erant autem privata illa ὑπερῶα loca a judæis ſemper *ſacris uſibus* deſtinata; ſaltem ex quo *Daniel* Propheta aſcendiſſe in *Cœnaculum* ad orandum diceretur. *Pearſon.* Lect. in Act. Apoſt. p. 31.

ſelf

CHAP. I.

ſelf ſeems to allude to this Name when ſpeaking of this Sacrament He ſays, *the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion* &c.[g]? They who would ſee more concerning This *Name*, may conſult, beſides Commentators, the Authors referred to at the Bottom of the Page[h]. I may juſt obſerve, by the Way, that Scruples have been raiſed againſt the Conſtruction here given; and ſome have thought, that the Texts might *poſſibly* be interpreted either of a *Love-Feaſt*, or elſe of a *Common Meal*. I think, very hardly, and not without ſome Violence. However, even *Whitby* and *Wolfius*, who appear to heſitate upon *Acts* II. 42, 46. yet are poſitive enough with Reſpect to *Acts* XX. 7. as relating to the *Euchariſt*: And ſince there is no Ground for Scruple, excepting only that the *Romaniſts* make an ill Uſe of this Conſtruction, and That may eaſily be obviated a better Way[i], I look upon the Conſtruction here given as ſufficiently ſupported. And it is ſome Confirmation of it, that *Ignatius*, of the Apoſtolical Times, makes uſe of the ſame Phraſe of *breaking Bread*, where He is plainly ſpeaking of this Holy Sacrament[k].

g 1 *Cor.* X. 16.

h *Caſaubon.* ad Annal. Eccleſ. Exerc. XVI. p. 378. alias p. 528.
Buxtorf. de Cœna Domini. p. 312, 313.
Suicer. Theſaur. in voc. κλάσις. p. 105.
Johan. Vorſtii Philolog. Sacr. Part 2. p. 200.
Towerſon. on the Sacraments, p. 166.

i Vid. *Caſaubon.* ad Annal. Eccl. Exercit. XVI. num. 48. p. 379.

k Ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες. *Ignat.* ad Epheſ. c. XX. p. 19.

A. D.

A. D. 57. *Communion.* Κοινωνία.

THE Name of *Communion* has been long famous, and was undoubtedly taken from St. *Paul*'s Account of this Sacrament, where He teaches that the Effect of this Service is the *Communion* of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt [l]. He does not indeed directly call the Sacrament by that *Name*, as others have done ſince; He was ſignifying what the *Thing* is, or what it does, rather than how it was then *called* [m]. But as his Account gave the firſt Occaſion for the *Name* of *Communion*, I thought it not amiſs to date it from thence. I find not that This Name became frequent in the *earlier* Centuries: The *Canons* called *Apoſtolical* are of *doubtful* Age. The *Roman* Clergy, in a Letter to the Clergy of *Carthage*, make uſe of the Name *Communion* in the Time of St. *Cyprian* [n], that is, about the Middle of the Third Century. But in the Age next following, it became very common, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers. The *Spaniſh* Fathers, in the Council of *Elvira* (A. D. 305.) make uſe of it, more than forty Times: The Councils of *Arles*, and of *Ancyra* (in 314, and 315.) made uſe of the ſame.

l 1 *Cor.* X. 16.

m Non appellat Paulus Cœnam Domini *Communionem* tanquam *proprio* ejus *nomine*; ſed vim & efficaciam Sacramenti hujus exprimens, ait eam eſſe *communionem*, ſive *participationem* corporis Chriſti. *Caſaubon.* Exercit. XVI. num. 47. p. 361.

n Si qui in hanc Tentationem inciderunt, cœperint apprehendi Infirmitate, & agant pœnitentiam Facti ſui, & deſiderent *communionem*, utique ſubveniri eis debet &c. Apud *Cyprian.* Epiſt. 2. p. 8. Bened. Ed.

The

CHAP. I. The Council of *Nice*, in the Year 325, ſpeaks of the ſame Sacrament under the Name of *Communion*[o], in their 13*th* Canon. *Hilary*, about the Middle of the ſame Century, ſtyles it ſometimes the *Communion of the Holy Body*, ſometimes the *Sacrament of the Holy Communion*, ſometimes the *Communion of the everlaſting Sacraments*[p]. A little later in the ſame Century, *Baſil* ſometimes has the ſingle Word *Communion*[q], to denote the Euchariſt: At other Times, He calls it the *Communion of the good Thing*, or of the *Sovereign Good*[r]. I need not deſcend to lower *Fathers*, amongſt whom the *Name* became very frequent: *Suicer*[ſ] has collected their Teſtimonies, obſerving withal the ſeveral Accounts which They gave of the *Name*, all reducible to Three. 1. The Sacrament is ſo called, becauſe of the *Communion* we therein hold with Chriſt and with each other. 2. Becauſe we are therein made *Partners* of Chriſt's *Kingdom*. 3. Becauſe it is a Religious *Banquet*, which we partake of in *common* with our Fellow-Chriſtians.

o Κοινωνίας πάλιν τυχών. Concil. Nicæn. Can. XIII. p. 330. Harduin.

p *Hilarius Pictavenſ.* p. 169, 223, 740. Edit. Bened.

q Κοινωνίαν οἵκοι καλέχοντες, ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν. ὁ μὲν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕκαστος καὶ τὸν ἐν λαῷ τελώνην, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖον, ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτε βούλεται μεταλαμβάνει δι' ἑαυτοῦ. *Baſil.* Epiſt. 93. p. 187. Edit. Bened. Aliàs Epiſt. 289.

r Κοινωνία τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. Epiſt. Canon. prima ad *Amphiloch.* p. 272. Epiſt. ſecunda p. 293.

ſ *Suicer.* Theſaur. in Κοινωνία. Conf. *Caſaubon.* Exercit. xvi. num. 47. p. 361. &c. aliàs 504. &c.

A.D.

A. D. 57. *Lord's Supper.*

I AM willing to ſet down the Name of *Lord's Supper*, as a Scripture-Name, occurring in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles [t]; which appears to be the moſt prevailing Opinion of learned *Proteſtants*. Not that I take it to be a *clear* Point at all, or ſo much as capable of being proved: But, I incline rather to thoſe, both Ancients and Moderns, who interpret that Place of the *Love-Feaſt*, kept in Imitation of our Lord's *Laſt Supper*, which was *previous* to the Original Euchariſt. Thus much however is certain, that in the Apoſtolical Times, the *Love-Feaſt* and the *Euchariſt*, though diſtinct, went together, and were nearly allied to each other, and were both of them celebrated at one Meeting. Without ſome ſuch Suppoſition as that, it was next to impoſſible to account for St. *Paul*'s quick Tranſition, in that Chapter, from one to the other. Whether therefore, *Lord's Supper* in that Chapter ſignifies the *Love-Feaſt* only, or the *Euchariſt* only, or *both together*, one Thing is clear and unqueſtionable, that They were both but different Parts of the ſame Solemnity, or different Acts of the ſame Meeting: And there is no Occaſion to be ſcrupulouſly nice and critical in diſtinguiſhing to which of the Parts the *Name* ſtrictly belongs [u].

Maldo-

t 1 *Cor.* XI. 20.

u Quid rei ſit *Cæna* hæc, accuratiùs inquirere non eſt opus: Sive enim Chriſtianorum *Agapæ*, ſive ipſa *Euchariſtia* ſignificetur, nil

CHAP. I.

Maldonate, the Jeſuit, in his Contents upon *Matt.* XXVI. 26. took upon him to reproach the *Proteſtants* in an unhandſome Manner, for ſpeaking of the Euchariſt under the Name of a *Supper*; which He thought irreverent, and not warranted by *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, or *ſound Reaſon* [w]. The learned *Caſaubon* ſome Time after, appeared in Behalf of the *Proteſtants* [x], and eaſily defended them, as to the main Thing, againſt the injurious Charge. *Albertinus*, long after, ſearched with all Diligence into ancient Precedents and Authorities for the *Name*, and produced them in great Abundance [y], more than ſufficient to confute the Charge of *Novelty*, *Raſhneſs*, or *Profaneneſs* on that Head. The Truth of the Matter ſeems to be, that tho' there is no clear Proof that the Name of *Supper* is a Scripture-Name, yet ſome Fathers (as high as the Fourth Century) thought that it was, ſo underſtanding 1 *Cor.* XI. 20. And many Interpreters of good Note have followed them in it. Indeed, it does not appear, that the *Text* was ſo conſtrued before the latter End of the Fourth Century, or that the Name of *Lord's Supper* was much in uſe, as a Name for the

nil intereſt, dummodo concedatur (quod nulla prorſus ratione negari poteſt) *Euchariſtiæ* celebrationem cum *Agapis* eſſe conjunctam. *Sam. Baſnag.* Annal. Tom. II. p. 296.

w *Calviniſtæ* ſine Scripturæ Auctoritate, ſine veterum Auctorum exemplo, ſine Ratione, nullo judicio, *cœnam* vocant. *Maldonat.* p. 556.

x *Caſaubon.* Exercit. XVI. num. 32. p. 368. alias 513.

y *Albertinus* de Euchariſtia. L. 1. c. 1.

Eucha-

Euchariſt. *Irenæus* once has the Name of *God's Supper*, but means quite another Thing by it [z]. *Tertullian* has the ſame [a] for *Lord's Table*, referring to 1 *Cor.* X. 22. not to 1 *Cor.* XI. 20. He has alſo the Phraſe of *Lord's Banquet* [b] [or *Lord's Day Banquet*] and *Banquet of God* [c], meaning the *Love-Feaſts* then in uſe, which He elſewhere ſtyles the *Supper of Chriſtians* [d]. But St. *Baſil* very plainly interprets *Lord's Supper* in that Text, of the Euchariſt [e]: Which even *Fronto Ducæus*, in his Notes upon the Place, confeſſes; endeavouring at the ſame Time, to bring off *Maldonate*, as fairly as the Matter would bear, while, in Reality, He yields the main Thing, with reſpect to the *Fathers*, at leaſt. However, it muſt be owned, that *Baſil* is the firſt who directly ſo interprets the Text, and that the *Fathers* were not all of a Mind about it, and that the Appellation of *Supper* was not very common till after the *Fourth* Century; and that even in the later Centuries the Name of *Lord's Supper* was a Name for that Supper which our Lord made *previous* to the Eucha- CHAP. I.

z Cœna Dei. Iren. L. IV. c. 36. p. 279. Ed. Bened.

a Non poſſumus Cœnam Dei edere, & Cœnam Dæmoniorum. *Tertullian.* de Spect. c. xiii. p. 79.

b Convivium Dominicum. *Tertull.* ad Uxor. c. iv. p. 168.

c *Convivium Dei.* *Tertull.* de Virgin. Vel. c. viii. p. 172.

d Cœna noſtra de nomine rationem ſui oſtendit: Id vocatur quod *dilectio* apud Græcos. *Tertull.* Apol. c. 39.

e ὥσπερ οὐδὲν κοινὸν σκεῦος ἐπιτρέπει ὁ λόγος εἰσφέρεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἅγια, οὕτως οὐδὲ τὰ ἅγια εἰς κοινὸν οἶκον ἐπιτηδεῖα. —— μήτε τὸν κοινὸν δεῖπνον ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, μήτε τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐν οἰκίᾳ καθυβρίζειν. *Baſil.* Regul. Brev. p. 310. p. 525. Ed. Bened. alias 657. Conf. *Theodorit.* in 1 Cor. XI. 20.

riſt:

CHAP. I.

riſt. The third Council of *Carthage* (A. D. 418.) ſpeaks of *one Day in the Year, in which the* Lord's Supper *was celebrated*[f]: Where it is plain, that *Lord's Supper* does not mean the Euchariſt, but the Supper proper to *Maundy-Thurſday* kept in Imitation of our Lord's *Paſchal* Supper, previous to the Euchariſt. And the like is mentioned in the *Trullan* Council (A. D. 683.) in their *29th Canon*[g]. So that *Lord's Supper* was not then become a familiar Name, as now, for the *Euchariſt*, but rather eminently denoted the *Supper* previous to it; either our Lord's *own*, or That which was afterwards obſerved by Chriſtians as a Memorial of it, being a kind of *Love-Feaſt*. I ſhall only add farther, that *Hilary* the *Deacon* (A. D. 380. or nearly) in his Comment upon 1 *Cor.* XI. ſeems to diſlike the Name of *Supper*[h], as applied to the Euchariſt, and therefore could not interpret the Text as *Baſil* of that Time did.

A. D. 96. *Oblation.* προσφορά.

THE Name of *Oblation* may, I think, be fairly carried up as high as to *Clemens* of *Rome*, who upon the loweſt Computation wrote his

f Μιᾶς ἐτησίας ἡμέρας ἐν ᾗ τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐπιτελεῖται.
Concil. Carthag. Can. 44. p. 567. Bevereg. Edit.

g Μιᾶς ἐτησίᾳ ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐπιτελεῖται.
Concil. Trull. Can. 29. p. 188.

h Oſtendit [Chriſtus] illis Myſterium Euchariſtiæ *inter cœnandum* celebratum, *non cœnam* eſſe: Medicina enim Spiritalis eſt, quæ cum Reverentia deguſtata, purificat ſibi devotum. *Pſeud. Ambroſ.* in Loc.

famous

famous Epiſtle as early as the Year 96. The more common Date is 70, or thereabout: But a learned and conſiderate Writer [i], who very lately has re-examined the Chronology of that Epiſtle, has with great Appearance of Probability brought it down to A. D. 96: And there I am willing to reſt it. CHAP. I.

Clemens ſpeaks of the *Oblations* and *Sacred Functions* of the Church, referring, very probably, to the *Euchariſtical Service* [k]: Neither can He without ſome Violence be interpreted to mean any Thing elſe. In another Place, He ſtill more plainly refers to the ſame, where He ſays: "It would be no ſmall Sin in us, "ſhould we caſt off Thoſe from the Epiſcopal Function, who holily and without Blame "*offer the Gifts* [l]. Here He expreſſly ſpeaks of Gifts *offered* (that is, of *Oblation*) and by *Sacerdotal* Hands. The *Gifts* were brought to the Altar, or Communion-Table by the *People*, and were recommended to God's Acceptance by the officiating Biſhop, or Preſbyter. So,

i *Lardner*. Credibility of Goſp. Hiſt. Part. II. Vol. I. p. 50. ——62.

k Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν —— τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι —— οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτοί εἰσι καὶ μακάριοι.

Clem. Rom. Ep. c. 40. p. 164. Edit. Cant.

Vitringa, upon theſe Words, allows that they refer to the *Euchariſt*. Preces haud dubiè intelliguntur cum *Sacris Euchariſtiæ*, quibus *Clemens* ſtatas Horas, ad exemplum Sacrorum Templi, definiri vult. *Vitring*. de Vet. Synag. p. 1115. conf. *Baſnag*. Annal. Vol. I. p. 371.

l Ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. c. 44. p. 178.

Compare *Johnſon* Unbl. Sacrifice. Part I. p. 75, 78, &c.

CHAP. I. there was first a kind of *Lay-Oblation*, and next a *Sacerdotal* Oblation of the same *Gifts* to God. Those *Gifts* consisted partly of *Alms* to the Poor, and partly of *Oblations*, properly so called, to the *Church*; and out of these last was usually taken the *Matter* of the Eucharist, the *Bread* and *Wine*[m]. The *Oblation*, as I before hinted, was twofold; hence the whole Service of the Eucharist came to be called the *Oblation*: And to communicate, or to administer, in Church-Language, was to *offer*. There was a *Third* Kind of *Oblation*[n] which came up afterwards, in the Third Century: Or, to speak more accurately, the *Commemoration*, which was always a Part of the Eucharistical Service, came by Degrees to be called an *Oblation*, (but not within the two first Centuries, so far as I can find) and then commenced a kind of *Third Oblation*; not a *new Thing*, but an old Service under a *new Name*.

Justin Martyr, though He does not directly call the Eucharist by the Name of *Oblation*, yet He does obliquely, where He says, that the *Oblation* of *fine Flour*, under the Law, was a Type of the *Bread* of the *Eucharist*[o]; and

m See *Bingham*. Eccles. Antiq. B. XV. Ch. 2. §. 1, 2. *Derlingius*. Observ. Miscellan. p. 301. *Constitut. Apostol.* L. VIII. c. 27. 30. *L'Arroque* Hist. of the Eucharist. Part I. Ch. IV. p. 30, &c.

n Of the *Third Oblation*, or *threefold* Oblation, see
L'Arroque Hist. of the Eucharist. Part I. Ch. VIII.
Sam. Basnag. Annal. Tom. I. p. 371.
Pfaffius Dissert. de Oblat. vet. Eucharist. p. 283. 293.

o Ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως προσφορὰ —— τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας. *Just. Dial.* p. 119. *Jebb.* 220. *Thirlby.*

where He ſpeaks of the Euchariſtical Elements as being *offered* to *God* [p]. Elſewhere He ſpeaks plainly of the *Lay Offering*, brought by the People to the Adminiſtrator [q]: And I preſume, He is to be underſtood of an Offering to be preſented *to God*, by the Hands of the Miniſter, brought to the Miniſter in order to be recommended by Him to the *Divine* Acceptance.

Irenæus, of the ſame Century, makes frequent mention of the *Oblation* of the Euchariſt, underſtanding by it the *whole* Service as performed by Clergy and People, according to their reſpective Parts or Provinces [r]. He ſuppoſes the Oblation made *to God*, made by the *Church*, in and by the proper Officers: And though the *Oblation* ſtrictly ſpeaking, according to its primary Signification, means only one Part of the Service, or two (*viz.* the People's bringing their *Offerings* to the Altar, and the

p Προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας. Juſt. Dial. p. 120. *Jebb.* Alias 220.

q Ἐπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ ὅτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ &c.

——— Ἄρτος προσφέρεται, καὶ εἶτος καὶ ὕδωρ. καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων τὸ Αμὴν'. Juſt. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 96, 98.

r Novi Teſtamenti novam docuit *oblationem*, quam *Eccleſia* ab Apoſtolis accipiens, in univerſo mundo *offert Deo*, ei qui Alimenta nobis præſtat, primitias ſuorum munerum &c. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 17. p. 249. Edit. Bened.

Eccleſiæ *Oblatio*, quam Dominus docuit *offerri* in univerſo mundo, purum Sacrificium repertum eſt &c. ——— Non genus Oblationum reprobatum eſt: Oblationes enim & illic, *Oblationes* autem & hic. p. 250. Hanc *Oblationem* Eccleſia ſolam puram *offert Fabricatori*, offerens ei cum Gratiarum actione, ex creatura ejus. p. 251.

CHAP. I.

Adminiſtrator's preſenting *the ſame* to God) yet from this Part, or Parts of the Service, the whole Solemnity took the Name of the *Oblation*, at that Time, and ſuch Name became very common and familiar afterwards. For ſince the very *Matter* of the Euchariſt was taken out of the *Oblations* received from the People, and ſolemnly *offered* up afterwards to God by the Miniſters, it was very natural to give the Name of *Oblation* to the whole Solemnity.

Tertullian ſpeaking of the *Devil*, as imitating the Myſteries of the Church, takes Notice, among other Things, of his inſtructing his Votaries to *baptize* and to celebrate the *Oblation of Bread*[s]: As much as to ſay, that They alſo had their Euchariſt, in their Way; *Oblation* being here the Name for the whole Service. In another Place, He uſes the ſingle Word *offer*, for the whole Action of adminiſtring, and receiving the Communion [t]. Elſewhere, He makes mention of *Oblations* for the *Dead*; and at the *Anniverſaries* of the *Martyrs*[u]: And by *Oblations* He could intend nothing but

s Tinguit & ipſe quoſdam ——— celebrat & *panis oblationem*. *Tertull.* de Præſcript. c. 40. p. 216.

t Ubi eccleſiaſtici ordinis non eſt conſeſſus, & *offers*, & *tinguis*, & Sacerdos es tibi ſolus. *Tertull.* de Exhort. Caſt. c. vii. p. 522. *conf.* de veland. Virg. c. ix. p. 178.

u *Oblationes* pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus. *Tertull.* de *Coron.* c. III. p. 102. *conf.* de exhort. Caſt c. XI. p. 523.

the *Euchariſtical Solemnities* celebrated on thoſe Days [w]. CHAP. I.

WE have ſeen Proofs ſufficient of the Name of *Oblation* for the two firſt Centuries. But it is obſervable, that all this Time, we meet only with Oblation of *Gifts*, or *Firſt Fruits*, or of *Bread*, *Wine*, or the like: No Oblation of *Chriſt*'s *Body*, or *Blood*, or of *Chriſt* abſolutely, as we ſhall find afterwards. Hence it is, that ſome very learned Men have thought that according to the Ancients, the *Oblation* was conſidered always as previous to *Conſecration*, and that the Elements were *offered* in order to be *conſecrated* [x]: Which indeed is true according to that Senſe of *Oblation* which obtained for two Centuries and a Half: But a *new Senſe*, or *new Application* of the Word, or Name, came in ſoon after, and ſo it will here be neceſſary to diſtinguiſh *Times*.

I SHALL now paſs on to *Cyprian*, to ſhew how this Matter ſtood, upon the *Change* of Language, introduced in his Time. We ſhall find Him plainly ſpeaking of the *offering* Chriſt's

w See *Bingham* B. XXIII. Ch. 3. §. 12, 13. *Deylingius* Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 95.

x "It is manifeſt, that it is called an *Oblation*, or *Sacrifice*, "in all Liturgies, according to the Style of the moſt ancient "Church Writers, *not as conſecrated*, but as *preſented*, and *offer-* "*ed* (whether by the People, as the Cuſtom was, to Him that "miniſtred, or by Him that miniſtred, to God) *to be conſecrated*. *Thorndike*, Relig. Aſſembl. p. 379.

Conſecrationi autem *Oblationem* præpoſitam olim fuiſſe, adeo perſpicuum ex *veterum* dictis, *Liturgiiſque* antiquiſſimis, maxime *Græcis*, eſſe arbitramur, ut nihil clarius eſſe poſſit. *Pfaff. Fragm. Iren.* in Præfat.

CHAP. I.

Body and *Blood*[y]. This muſt be underſtood of an Oblation ſubſequent to Conſecration, not in order to it: For, Chriſt's Body and Blood, whether real or ſymbolical, are *holy*, and could want no Sanctification, or Conſecration. He further ſeems to ſpeak of *offering* Chriſt Himſelf[z], in this Sacrament, unto God, but under the Symbols of *conſecrated* Bread and Wine. That may be his Meaning: And the Meaning is good, when rightly apprehended; for there was nothing new in it but the *Language*, or the Manner of Expreſſion. What the elder Fathers would have called, and did call the *commemorating* of Chriſt, or the *commemorating* his *Paſſion*, his *Body* broken, or *Blood* ſhed; That *Cyprian* calls the *offering* of Chriſt, or of his *Paſſion*, &c. becauſe, in a large Senſe, even *commemorating* is *offering*, as it is preſenting the Thing or the Perſon ſo commemorated, in the way of Prayer and Thankſgiving, before God. I do not invent this Account for the clearing a Difficulty, but I take it from *Cyprian* Himſelf, whoſe own Words ſhew that the Euchariſtical

y Obtulit [Dominus] hoc idem quod Melchiſedech obtulerat. id eſt Panem & Vinum, ſuum ſcilicet *Corpus & Sanguinem*. Cyprian. Ep. 63. p. 105. Edit Bened. Unde apparet *Sanguinem* Chriſti non *offerri*, ſi deſit vinum calici &c. p. 107.

z Nam ſi Jeſus Chriſtus Dominus & Deus noſter ipſe eſt ſummus Sacerdos Dei Patris, & Sacrificium Patri *ſeipſum primus obtulit*, & *Hoc fieri* in ſui commemorationem præcepit, utique ille Sacerdos vice Chriſti verè fungitur, qui *id quod Chriſtus fecit*, imitatur, & ſic incipiat *offerre* ſecundum *quod ipſum Chriſtum* videat *obtuliſſe*. Ibid. p. 109. Quia Paſſionis ejus mentionem in Sacrificiis omnibus facimus (Paſſio eſt enim Domini, Sacrificium quod offerimus) nihil aliud quam *quod ille fecit*, facere debemus. p. 109.

Commemo-

Commemoration was all the while in his Mind [a], and that That was all He meant by the *Oblation* which He there ſpeaks of, uſing a new Name for an old Thing. I ſhall ſhew in due Time, that the later Fathers who followed *Cyprian*'s Language in this Particular, and who admitted this *third* Oblation (as ſome have called it) as well as He, yet when they came to explain, interpreted it to mean no more than a ſolemn *Commemoration*, ſuch as I have mentioned. CHAP. I.

I MUST farther obſerve, that though *Cyprian* ſometimes advances this new kind of Language, yet elſewhere He follows the more ancient Way of Speaking, and underſtands *Oblation* as other Fathers before Him had done. Thus, when He ſpeaks of the Sacrifice *offered* in the Euchariſt by the *Poor* [b], He means it of the *Lay-Oblation* which was previous to Conſecration; as alſo when He ſpeaks of the Clergy's *preſenting* the *Oblations* of the People [c], He is to be underſtood of the *firſt* and *ſecond* Oblations, both of them previous to Conſecration. And when He obſerves, that an *Oblation* cannot be *ſanctified* where the Spirit is not given [d], He

a Calix qui in *commemorationem* (alias *commemoratione*) ejus offertur. p. 104. Quotieſcunque ergo calicem in *commemorationem* Domini & paſſionis ejus offerimus, id quod conſtat Dominum feciſſe, faciamus. p. 109.

b Partem de Sacrificio quod pauper *obtulerit*, ſumis. *Cypr.* de Op. & Eleem. p. 242.

c Qui communicando cum lapſis, & offerendo *oblationes* eorum &c. Ep. 28. p. 38.

d Nec *oblatio* illic ſanctificari poſſit, ubi Spiritus Sanctus non eſt. Ep. 64. p. 112.

CHAP. I

uſes the Word *Oblation* for what was antecedent; and it amounts to the ſame as if He had ſaid, that ſuch an Oblation could not be *conſecrated*, could not be made the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt. But enough hath been ſaid of the *Name* of *Oblation* in this Place: The *Thing* will be more diſtinctly conſidered hereafter.

A. D. 104. *Sacrament.*

THE Name of *Sacrament*, as applied to the Euchariſt, though no Scripture-Name, yet certainly is of great Antiquity. The younger *Pliny*, in his Letter to the Emperor *Trajan*, will afford us a good Argument of it, in what He reports of the *Chriſtians*, and from the *Chriſtians*, as meeting on a certain Day (the Lord's Day) and binding themſelves by a *Sacrament*, to commit no Wickedneſs, but to lead good Lives [e]. As *Pliny* there reported what the *Chriſtians* had told Him, it is reaſonable to judge, that they had made uſe of the Word *Sacrament* to Him, which They underſtood in the *Chriſtian* Senſe, however *Pliny*, or *Trajan* might take it: And ſo this Teſtimony will amount to a probable Proof of the Uſe of the Name

e Adfirmabant autem, hanc fuiſſe ſummam vel culpæ ſuæ, vel erroris, quod eſſent ſoliti, ſtato die, ante Lucem convenire, carmenque Chriſto quaſi Deo dicere ſecum invicem: Seque *Sacramento* non in ſcelus aliquod *obſtringere*, ſed ne Furta, ne Latrocinia, ne Adulteria committerent, ne Fidem fallerent, ne depoſitum appellati abnegarent: Quibus peractis, morem ſibi diſcedendi fuiſſe, rurſuſque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiſcuum tamen & innoxium. *Plin.* Epiſt. 97. L. X. p. 819. Ed. Amſtel. conf. *Tertullian.* Apol. c. II. p. 24. 25. Lud.

of

of *Sacrament* among the Chriſtians of that Time. That the Name, as there uſed, is to be underſtood of the *Euchariſt*, is a very clear Caſe, from all the Circumſtances of the Account. I know not how a late learned and judicious Writer came to underſtand it of the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*[f]. The generality of the beſt learned Men[g] interpret it of the *Euchariſt*, and with very good Reaſon: For, the Account refers to what the *whole* Aſſembly were wont to do, at the ſame Time; they could not at all come to receive *Baptiſm*, tho' they might to receive the *Euchariſt*. Then the mention of the Sacrament as taken in the *Antelucan* Meetings, tallies exactly with *Tertullian*'s Account of the *Euchariſt*, as we ſhall ſee preſently: Beſides that the Hint given of the *Love-Feaſt* as following ſoon after, confirms the ſame Thing[h].

CHAP. I.

I GO on then to *Tertullian*, who makes expreſs mention of the *Sacrament of the Euchariſt*, as received in his Time, but with ſome difference, as to the Circumſtances, from the *Original Euchariſt* of our Lord's own celebrating[i]. For That (He obſerves) was after Supper, This before Day-light, faſting: In That, the Company help'd one another, or every Man took his

f Dr. *Wall* Inf. Bapt. Part II. Chap. ix. p. 396. 3d Edit.

g Vid. *Bevereg.* Vindic. Can. p. 199. *Tentzel.* Exercit. Select. Part 2. p. 127. *Vitringa* de Vet. Synagog. p. 1116. *Renaudotius* Liturg. Orient. Tom. I. p. 5, 6. *Bingham* XV. 7, 8.

h See *Bingham* B. XV. c. 7. §. 8.

i *Euchariſtiæ Sacramentum, & in Tempore victus, & omnibus* mandatum a Domino; etiam *Antelucanis* cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam *præſidentium* ſumimus. *Tertull.* de Coron. c. III. p. 102.

Part

CHAP. I.

Part from the Table[k]; in This, the Biſhop or Presbyter in Perſon gave the Bread and Cup to each Communicant. But what I have principally to take notice of here, is the uſe of the Phraſe, *Sacrament of the Euchariſt*, conformable to the like Phraſes, which the ſame Author makes uſe of to denote *Baptiſm*, calling it the *Sacrament of Water*[l], and *Sacrament of Sanctification*[m]. In the ſame Century, *Cyprian* calls the *Euchariſt* the *Sacrament of the Cup*[n]; and elſewhere, the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Paſſion and of our Redemption*[o].

IF it ſhould now be asked, in what preciſe Meaning the Name of *Sacrament* was thus anciently applied to the *Euchariſt*; as the Word *Sacrament* is of great Latitude, and capable of various Significations, (ſome ſtricter and ſome larger) I know of no certain Way of determining the preciſe Meaning of the *Name*, as here applied, but by conſidering what was meant by the *Thing*. *Gerard Voſſius*[p] has perhaps given as clear and accurate an Account of the Word *Sacrament*, as one ſhall any where meet with: But after all, I am of Opinion, that it is not the *Name* which can here add any Light to the *Thing*, but the *Thing* it ſelf

k *Luke* XXII. 17. See Archbiſhop *Potter*. on Ch. G. p. 259. Edit. 3d.

l Sacramentum Aquæ. *Tertull.* de Bapt. c. 1. p. 224. c. XII. p. 229.

m Sacramentum Sanctificationis. Ibid. c. IV. p. 225.

n *Sacramentum Calicis*. *Cyprian*. de Lapſis p. 189.

o Sacramentum Dominicæ Paſſionis, & Redemptionis noſtræ. *Cyprian*. Ep. 63.

p *Voſſius* de Sacram. vi & efficacia. opp. Tom. VI. p. 247, &c.

muſt

must be firſt rightly underſtood, in order to ſettle the true and full Import of the *Name*. When it is applied to *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt*, it muſt be explained by their *common* Nature, being a *general* Name for ſuch a certain number of Ideas as go to make up their general Nature, or Notion. A Collection of thoſe ſeveral Ideas is put together in the *Definition* given in our *Church Catechiſm*. The like had been endeavoured before, in our 25th Article: And That is again digeſted into a more technical Form, by Bp. *Burnet* in his *Expoſition*[q]. His Definition may be looked upon as a good ſummary Account of what *our Church*, and the *Proteſtant Churches* abroad, and the *Primitive Churches* likewiſe, believed concerning *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt* in common: The Particulars of their Faith, ſo far, is therein collected into one large complex Idea, and for Conveniency, is comprized in the ſingle Word *Sacrament*. And yet it muſt be obſerved, that this Word *Sacrament*, as applied to thoſe two Religious Rites, admits of a threefold Acceptation in Church-Writers: Sometimes denoting barely the *outward Sign* of each, ſometimes the *Thing ſignified*, and ſometimes *Both together*, the whole Action, Service or Solemnity[r].

CHAP. I.

THE *Socinians*, obſerving that the *received* Senſe of the Word *Sacrament* is againſt their whole Scheme, have often expreſſed their Diſlike of it. *Smalcius*, particularly complains of

q *Burnet* on Article XXV. p. 2 68, 269.
r Vid. *Lamb. Danæus*. Iſag. Part IV. L. 5. p. 441.

it,

CHAP. I.

it, as an *unſcriptural* Name, and beſides *Barbarous Latin*, and leading to *Superſtition* and *Idolatry*; and therefore He moves to have it totally laid aſide [f]. He was offended, it ſeems, at the *Name*, becauſe it ſerved to keep up the Senſe of ſomething *Myſterious*, or *Myſtical*, of a *Sign* and ſomewhat *ſignified*, viz. *Grace* &c. to which He had an Averſion. *Volkelius*, more complaiſant with reſpect to the *Name*, turns all his Reſentment upon the *Thing*, flatly denying that the Euchariſt is a *Sacrament* [t]: His reaſon is, becauſe it neither *exhibits* nor *ſeals* any *Spiritual Grace*. His Maſter *Socinus* had intimated as much before [u]. The Sum is, that the ſtrict Senſe of the Sacrament, as implying an *outward Sign* of an *inward Grace*, can never ſuit with their Schemes, who allow of no *inward Grace* at all.

I MAY here note by the way, that while the *Socinians* reject the *inviſible Grace*, the *Romaniſts* deſtroy the *viſible Sign*, and both run counter to the true Notion of a *Sacrament*, by their oppoſite Extremes: From whence it is manifeſt, of what Moment it is, to preſerve

f Vox *Sacramenti*, in hac Significatione, *barbara*, vel ſaltem *Sacris Literis incognita* eſt; ab Hominibus vero otioſis (qui ceremoniis hujuſmodi neſcio quid præter Sacram Scripturam *Superſtitioſum*, aut etiam *Idololatricum* ex parte, tribuere non ſunt veriti) ad tegendum dolum uſurpata: præſtat igitur aliis nominibus appellari in Chriſti cœtu hanc Ceremoniam. *Smalcius* contr. Frantz. p. 347.

t Satis conſtat nec alteram Appellationem, nimirum *Sacramentum* corporis Chriſti, veram eſſe. Si enim Hæc Actio ne *Sacramentum* quidem eſt, quo pacto, quæſo, *Corporis Chriſti Sacramentum* erit? *Volkel.* de Ver. Relig. Lib. IV. cap. xxii. p. 678.

u *Socinus* de Baptiſm. Aquæ. cap. xiv.

the

the Word *Sacrament*, and to aſſert to it its *true* and *full* Senſe. For, though the Word, as here applied, is not in Scripture, yet the *Notion* is there, and the *general* Doctrine is there: And the throwing that *Notion*, or that *general Doctrine* under the Name of *Sacrament*, is nothing more than collecting ſeveral *Scripture-Ideas*, or *Scripture-Truths*, and binding them up together in a *ſingle* Word, for the better preſerving them, and for the Eaſe and Convenience of Speech. But as to the *Proof* of thoſe Doctrines, or thoſe Truths, I cannot enter into it now, but muſt reſerve it for a more proper Place, and proceed in the Account of ancient *Names*.

CHAP. I.

A. D. 107. *Euchariſt.*

ANOTHER *Name*, as famous as any, is the Name *Euchariſt*, ſignifying properly *Thankſgiving*, or *Bleſſing*, and fitly denoting this Holy Service, conſidered as a Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiving. I ſet the Date no higher than *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, becauſe there it firſt certainly occurs: Tho' one can make no doubt of its having obtained in the *Apoſtolical* Age, when it is conſidered how familiar *Ignatius* makes uſe of it[w]. Some have thought that St. *Paul* Himſelf led the Way, as to this *Name*. 1 *Cor.* xiv. 16. But That Conſtruction of the Text appears too *conjectural* to build upon, and is rejected by the Generality of Interpreters: I

w *Ignatius*. Epiſt. ad *Smyrn.* c. 7, 8. ad *Philadelph.* c. 4.

think,

CHAP. I. think, with good Reaſon, as *Eſtius* in particular hath manifeſted upon the Place. I content myſelf therefore with running up that *Name* no higher than *Ignatius*'s Time.

AFTER Him, *Juſtin Martyr* [x], *Irenæus* [y], *Clemens* of *Alexandria* [z], *Origen* [a], and others make familiar uſe of that Name, as is well known. One may judge how extenſive and prevailing that Name, above any other, anciently was, from this Conſideration, that it paſſed not only among the *Greeks*, but among the *Orientaliſts* alſo (as may be ſeen in the *Syriac* Verſion, before mentioned) and likewiſe among the *Latins*; who adopted that very Greek Word into their own Language; as is plain from *Tertullian* [b], and *Cyprian* [c], in many Places.

A. D. 150. *Sacrifice.* Θυσία.

Juſtin Martyr is the firſt I meet with, who ſpeaks of the Euchariſt under the Name of *Sacrifice*, or *Sacrifices*. But he does it ſo often, and ſo familiarly [d], that one cannot but conceive,

x *Juſtin.* M. Apol. 96. Dialog. p. 220. 386. *Thirlby.*
y *Irenæus.* p. 251. 294. 341. 360. Ed. Bened.
z *Clem. Alex.* Pædag. Lib. II. cap. 2. p. 178. Ed. Oxon.
a *Origen.* contr. Celſ. L. VIII. §. 57. p. 784. Ed. Bened.
b *Tertullian.* p. 102. 135. 215. 220, 562. 570. Rigalt.
c *Cyprian.* Tract. p. 132. 147. 230. Ep. p. 34. 37. 38. 39. 117. 118. 125. 190. 191. 223. Ox. Edit.
d Περὶ ὧν τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε —— *Juſt.* Dialog. p. 220. Edit. Lond.
—— θυσίας ἃς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου — Ibid. p. 386.

—— ὅτι

ceive, that it had been in common Uſe for ſome Time before: And it is the more likely to have been ſo, becauſe *Oblation* (which is near akin to it) certainly was, as we have ſeen above. CHAP. I.

Irenæus of the ſame Century mentions the *Sacrifice* of the Euchariſt, more than once[e], either directly or obliquely. *Tertullian*, not many Years later, does the like[f]. *Cyprian* alſo ſpeaks of the *Sacrifice* in the Euchariſt, underſtanding it, in one particular Paſſage, of the *Lay-Oblation*[g]. This is not the Place to examine critically, what the Ancients meant by the *Sacrifice* or *Sacrifices* of the Euchariſt: It will deſerve a diſtinct Chapter in another Part of this Work. But, as I before obſerved of *Oblation*, that, anciently, it was underſtood ſometimes of the *Lay-Offering*, the ſame I obſerve

——— ὅτι μὲν ἓν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι· ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρείληφεν ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ——— Ibid. p. 387.

e Eccleſiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in univerſo mundo, purum *Sacrificium* reputatum eſt apud Deum &c. ——— ——— Sacrificia in populo, *Sacrificia* & in eccleſia —— Iren. L. IV. c. 18. p. 250. omni autem loco *Sacrificium* offeretur ei, & hoc purum. L. IV. c. 17. p. 249.

f Non putant plerique *Sacrificiorum orationibus* interveniendum ——— Accepto corpore Domini & reſervato, utrumque ſalvum eſt, & participatio *Sacrificii*, & executio officii. *Tertull.* de Orat. c. 14. p. 135, 136. Aut *Sacrificium* offertur, aut Dei ſermo adminiſtratur. *De cultu Fem.* L. 2. c. 11.

g Locuples, & dives es, & Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ corban omnino non reſpicis, quæ in Dominicum ſine *Sacrificio* venis, quæ partem de *Sacrificio* quod pauper obtulit ſumis. *Cyprian.* de op. & eleemoſ. p. 242. Bened. alias 223.

now

CHAP. I.

now of *Sacrifice*; and it is plain from *Cyprian*. Beſides that Notion of Sacrifice, there was another, and a principal one, which was conceived to go along with the *Euchariſtical* Service, and that was the Notion of *Spiritual Sacrifice*, conſiſting of many Particulars, as ſhall be ſhewn hereafter: And it was on the account of one, or both, that the Euchariſt had the Name of *Sacrifice*, for the two firſt Centuries. But by the Middle of the third Century, if not ſooner, it began to be called a *Sacrifice*, on account of the *grand Sacrifice* repreſented and commemorated in it; the *Sign*, as ſuch, now adopting the Name of the *Thing ſignified*. In ſhort, the *Memorial* at length came to be called a *Sacrifice*, as well as an *Oblation*: And it had a double Claim to be ſo called; partly as it was in itſelf a *Spiritual* Service, or *Sacrifice*, and partly, as it was a Repreſentation and Commemoration of the high tremendous *Sacrifice* of Chriſt God-Man. This laſt View of it, being of all the moſt awful, and moſt endearing, came by Degrees to be the moſt prevailing Acceptation of the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*, as held forth in the Euchariſt. But thoſe who ſtyled the Euchariſt a *Sacrifice* on that Account, took Care, as often as Need was, to explain it off to a *Memorial* of a Sacrifice rather than a ſtrict or proper *Sacrifice*, in that preciſe View. *Cyprian*, I think, is the firſt who plainly and directly ſtyles the Euchariſt a *Sacrifice* in the *commemorative* View, and as *repreſenting*

ſenting the grand Sacrifice [h]. Not that there was any Thing *new* in the *Doctrine*, but there was a *new Application* of an old Name, which had at the firſt been brought in upon other Accounts. I ſhall endeavour to ſet That whole Matter clear in a Chapter below: For the preſent, theſe few Hints may ſuffice, and ſo I paſs on. CHAP. I.

A. D. 150. *Commemoration, Memorial.*
Ἀνάμνησις, Μνήμη.

Juſtin Martyr, if I miſtake not, once names the Euchariſt a *Commemoration* or *Memorial*; where He takes notice, that the Chriſtians offered up Spiritual Sacrifices, *Prayers* and *Lauds, in the Memorial of their Food dry and liquid* [i], that is, in the Euchariſt of Bread and Wine. I know not how otherwiſe to conſtrue Ἀνάμνησις there, but as a *Name* of the whole Service. It was natural enough, becauſe many of the other *Names*, which have been uſed to denominate the *whole* Service, (as *breaking Bread*, *Oblation*, *Sacrifice*, and *Euchariſt*) manifeſtly took their Original from ſome noted *Part* of the Solemnity, and were at firſt but *partial* Conceptions of it. Now ſince the *Commemoration*, or *Memorial* was always a conſiderable *Part* of the Solemnity (as

h Paſſionis ejus mentionem in *Sacrificiis* omnibus facimus: *Paſſio* eſt enim Domini *Sacrificium* quod offerimus.
Cyprian. Ep. 63. p. 109. Bened.

i Ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ μέμνηται.
Juſt. Dial. 387.

CHAP. I. the Learned well know) it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that That alſo might be made uſe of in like Manner, as a *Name* for the whole Service.

I AM aware that our excellent Mr. *Mede* gives a very different Turn to that Paſſage of *Juſtin*, tranſlating it thus: *In that thankful Remembrance of their Food both dry and liquid, wherein alſo is commemorated the Paſſion, which the Son of God ſuffered by Himſelf.* He interprets it of *agnizing* God as the *Giver of our Food both dry and liquid*[k]. But that Conſtruction muſt needs appear harſh, and unnatural. *Juſtin* no where elſe does ever ſpeak of the *Remembrance* of our *Food*, but conſtantly underſtands the Euchariſtical *Remembrance*, or *Commemoration*, to refer to Chriſt only, his *Incarnation* and *Paſſion*, his *Body* and *Blood*[l]: Nor do I know of any one *Father* who interprets the Memorial of the Bodily Food. Beſides, it ſuits not well with our Lord's own Account in his *Inſtitution* of the Sacrament, which ſpeaks of the Remembrance of *Him*, not of the Remembrance of our *Bodily Food*. Add to this, that were the Senſe of the Place ſuch as Mr. *Mede* imagin'd, *Juſtin* would rather have expreſſed it by a thankful Remembrance of the *Divine Goodneſs* in giving us our Food, than by a thankful Remembrance of *our Food*, which appears flat, and inſipid, in Compariſon. Seeing then that Mr. *Mede*'s Conſtruction of that Place in *Ju-*

k *Mede.* Chriſtian Sacrifice. B. II. Ch. V. p. 460.
l Vid. *Juſt. Mart.* Dialog. p. 220. 290.

ſtin, is far from ſatisfactory, I chooſe to acquieſce in the Senſe which I before mention'd, till I ſee a better; underſtanding the *Memorial of Food*, as equivalent to *Memorial* of Chriſt's Paſſion, *made by Food, viz.* by *Bread* and *Wine*. The Word *alſo* refers not there to *Memorial*, as if there were two Memorials, but to the *Lauds*; beſides which there was *alſo* a *Memorial* of the *Paſſion*. CHAP. I.

Origen has a Paſſage relating to the Euchariſtical *Memorial*, where He appears to denominate the whole Service by that eminent Part of it [m]. *Euſebius* ſtyles the Euchariſt, the *Memorial* of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood* [n], and alſo ſimply, a *Memorial*; which He obſerves to have ſucceeded in the Room of *Sacrifice* [o]. He calls it alſo the *Memorial of the Sacrifice* [p], and *Memorial of the grand Sacrifice* [q]. I need not deſcend lower, to fetch in more Authorities for the Uſe of this *Name*: Only, I may juſt give a Hint, that all thoſe Fathers who interpreted the Name *Sacrifice*, as applied in ſuch a particular View to the Euchariſt, by a *Memorial of a Sacrifice*, may as reaſonably be un-

m Si referantur hæc ad Myſterii magnitudinem, invenies *commemorationem* iſtam habere ingentis Propitiationis effectum. —— Si reſpicias ad illam *commemorationem* de qua dicit Dominus, *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, invenias quod iſta eſt *commemoratio* ſola, quæ propitium facit Hominibus Deum.
Origen. in Levit. Hom. XIII. p. 255. Ed. Bened.

n Τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν.
Euſeb. Demonſtrat. Evangel. L I. c. 10. p. 27.

o Μνήμῃ καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς, ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ θεῷ δι' ἡνεκὲς προσφέρειν.
Ibid. p. 38. Conf. Apoſt. Conſt. L. VI. c. 23.

p Τέτου δῆτα τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζῃ σκλελεῖν, διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος. p. 30.

q Τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος. p. 40.

CHAP. I.

derſtood to call the Euchariſt a *Memorial*, as to call it a *Sacrifice*. Thoſe Fathers were many; and *Chryſoſtom* may be eſteemed their Chief: Who while He follows the ordinary Language in denominating the Euchariſt a *Sacrifice* (conſidered in its *repreſentative* View) yet intimates withal, that its more proper Appellation, in that View, is *a Memorial of a Sacrifice*[r]. I may further take Notice, that St. *Auſtin* comes very near to what I have been ſpeaking of, where He calls the Euchariſt by the Name of *the Sacrament of Commemoration*, or *Sacramental Memorial*[f]. To conclude this Article, let the Reader obſerve and bear in Mind, that the Names of *Oblation*, and *Sacrifice*, as applied to the Euchariſt in one particular Point of View, do both of them reſolve into the Name *Memorial*: And ſo far they are all three to be looked upon as *equivalent* Names, bearing the ſame Senſe, pointing to the ſame Thing. This Obſervation will be of Uſe, when we come to

r Προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμεθα τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. ——— τὴν αὐτὴν θυσίαν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν, μᾶλλόν τε ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. *Chryſoſt.* in Epiſt. ad Hebr. c. X. Hom. 17. p. 856. Compare.

Theodorit. in Hebr. viii. 4. p. 433.
Pſeud-Ambroſ. in Hebr. c. X.
Primaſius. in Hebr. c. X.
Heſychius. in Levit. p. 31.
Eulogius. apud Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1609.
Fulgentius. de Fide ad Petr. c. 60. p. 525. Fragm. 618.
Oecumenius. in Hebr. X. p. 846.
Theophylact. in Hebr. X. 1. p. 971.

f *Sacramentum Memoriæ.* Auguſtin. contr. Pauſt. L. XX. c. 21. p. 348. Compare *L'Arroque* Hiſt. of the Euchariſt. Part. 1. Ch. VIII. p. 88, 89.

conſider

consider the Euchariſt in its *Sacrificial View* under a diſtinct Chapter below. CHAP. I.

A. D. 249. *Paſſover.*

THE Name of *Paſſover* has been anciently given to the Euchariſt, upon a Preſumption, that as *Chriſt* Himſelf ſucceeded to the *Paſchal Lamb*, ſo the *Feaſt* of the *Euchariſt* ſucceeded in the room of the *Paſchal Feaſt*. Chriſt is our *Paſſover*, as the Name ſtands for the *Lamb* [t]: The Euchariſt is our *Paſſover*, as that ſame Name ſtands for the *Feaſt*, *Service*, or *Solemnity*.

Origen ſeems to have led the Way; and therefore I date the Notion from his Time: Not that He ſpeaks ſo fully to the Point as ſome that came after, neither had He preciſely the ſame Ideas of it; but He taught more confuſedly, what others after Him improved, and cleared. *Origen* takes Notice, that "if a Man "conſiders that *Chriſt our Paſſover was ſacrificed for us*, and that He ought to *keep the* "*Feaſt* by *feeding upon the Fleſh of the Logos*, "He may celebrate the *Paſſover* all his Life "long, *paſſing on* to Godwards in Thought, "Word, and Deed, abſtracted from Temporal "Things [u]. I give his *Senſe*, rather than a

t 1 Cor. V. 7. John i. 29.

u Ἔτι δὲ ὁ νοήσας, ὅτι τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστὸς, καὶ χρὴ ἑορτάζειν ἐσθίοντα τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ λόγου· οὗτος ἔστιν ὅτε οὐ ποιεῖ τὸ πάσχα, ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται διαβατήρια, διαβαίνων ἀεὶ τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ πράξει ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ βίου πραγμάτων ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ σπεύδων. *Origen.* contr. Celſ. L. VIII. p. 759. Ed. Bened. alias p. 392.

CHAP. I.

literal rendring. Here we may obſerve, that the Chriſtian *Paſſover-Feaſt*, according to Him, conſiſts in the *eating of the Fleſh of the Logos*; which is certainly done in the *Euchariſt* by every *faithful* Receiver, as *Origen* every where allows: But then *Origen*'s common Doctrine is, that the *Fleſh of the Logos* may be eaten alſo out of the Euchariſt; for, the receiving *Spiritual Nutriment*, any way, is with Him, *eating* the *Fleſh* of Chriſt [w]. So that this Paſſage which I have cited from Him, does not make the *Euchariſt*, in particular, or *ſolely*, to be the Chriſtian *Paſchal Feaſt*: But the taking in *Spiritual Food*, be it in that Way, or any other, That is the *keeping* our *Paſſover*, according to his Senſe of it. *Hilary*, of the fourth Century, ſeems directly to give the Name of *Paſſover* to the *Chriſtian* Euchariſt [x]. *Nazianzen*, a great admirer of *Origen*, improves the Thought, applying it directly, and ſpecially to the *Euchariſt*, in theſe Words: "We ſhall partake of the "*Paſſover*, which even now is but a *Type*, tho' "much more plain, than the *old* one: For, I "am bold to ſay, that the *Legal* Paſſover was "an obſcurer *Type* of another *Type* [y].

w Bibere autem dicimur Sanguinem Chriſti, non ſolum *Sacramentorum ritu*, ſed & cum *Sermones* ejus recipimus, in quibus *vita* conſiſtit. Sicut & ipſe dicit, *verba quæ locutus ſum, Spiritus & Vita eſt*. *Origen*. in num. Hom. XVI. p. 334. Edit. Bened.

x *Judas* proditor indicatur, ſine quo *Paſcha*, accepto calice & fracto pane, conficitur. *Hilar*. in Matt. c. xxx. p. 740. Ed. Bened.

y Μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ πάσχα νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον· τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος. *Nazianz*. Orat. 52. p. 692.

St. *Jerome*

St. *Jerome*, who was once *Nazianzen*'s Scholar, follows Him in the ſame Sentiment, ſtyling the Euchariſt *the true Sacrament of the Paſſover*, in Oppoſition to the *old* one [z]. But no one dwells more upon that Thought, or more finely illuſtrates it, than the great St. *Chryſoſtom* in divers Places. He aſks, why our Lord celebrated the *Paſſover*? And his Anſwer is, becauſe the *old* Paſſover was the Figure of the *future one*, and it was proper after exhibiting the *Shadow*, to bring in the *Truth* alſo upon the *Table* [a]: A little after, He ſays, it is our *Paſſover to declare the Lord's Death* [b], quoting 1 *Cor.* XI. 26. And he adds, that whoever comes with a pure Conſcience, celebrates the *Paſſover*, as often as He *receives* the *Communion*, be it to Day, or to Morrow, or at any Time whatever [c]. And He has more in the ſame Place, to the ſame Purpoſe. In another Work He ſpeaks thus: "When the *Sun* of Righte-"ouſneſs appeared, the *Shadow* diſappeared: "—— Therefore upon the ſelf ſame *Table* "both the *Paſſovers* were celebrated, the *ty-*

CHAP. I.

z Poſtquam *Typicum Paſcha* fuerat impletum, & Agni carnes cum Apoſtolis comederat, aſſumit *Panem*, qui confortat cor Hominis, & ad verum *Paſchæ* tranſgreditur *Sacramentum*: ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus *Melchiſedec*, ſummi Dei Sacerdos, panem & vinum offerens fecit, ipſe quoque veritatem ſui corporis & Sanguinis repræſentaret. *Hieronym.* in Matt. c. xxvi. p. 128. Ed. Bened.

a *Chryſoſtom.* Tom. I. Orat. contr. Jud. 3. p. 610. Edit. Bened.

b Πάσχα δέ ἐστι, τὸ τὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλειν. Ibid. p. 611.

c Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ, κἂν σήμερον, κἂν αὔριον, κἂν ὀπωσδηποῦν μεταλάχῃ τῆς κοινωνίας. Ibid. p. 612.

CHAP. I. "*pical* and the *real*[d]. A little lower, He calls the Euchariſt the *Spiritual Paſſover*[e]. *Iſidorus Peluſiota*, afterwards ſtyles it the *divine* and *true* Paſſover[f]. And St. *Auſtin* obſerves, that the Jews celebrate their *Paſſover in a Lamb*, and we receive *ours* in the *Body* and *Blood* of the Lord[g]. Theſe are Authorities ſufficient for the *Name* of *Paſſover* as applied to the Euchariſt: For, like as Baptiſm is in Scripture-Account the *Chriſtian Circumciſion*[h], ſo is the Euchariſt, in Church-Account at leaſt, the *Chriſtian Paſſover*.

A. D. 385. *Maſs. Miſſa.*

THERE is one Name more, a *Latin* Name, and proper to the *Weſtern* Churches, which may juſt deſerve mentioning, becauſe of the warm Diſputes which have been raiſed about it ever ſince the *Reformation*. It is the Name *Maſs*, in Latin *Miſſa*; originally importing nothing more than the *Diſmiſſion* of a Church-Aſſembly[i]. By Degrees it came to be uſed

d Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τραπέζῃ ἑκάτερον γίνεται πάσχα, καὶ τὸ τοῦ τύπου, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας. *Chryſoſt.* de prodit. Jud. Hom. I. Tom. II. p. 383. ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τραπέζης, καὶ τὸ τυπικὸν πάσχα ὑπέγραψε, καὶ τὸ ἀληθινὸν προσέθηκε. Ibid. p. 383.

e Τὸ πνευματικὸν πάσχα. Ibid.

f Τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀληθινὸν πάσχα. *Iſidor. Peluſ.* L. IV. Epiſt. 162. p. 504. Edit. Pariſ.

g Aliud eſt *Paſcha* quod adhuc Judæi de ove celebrant, aliud autem quod nos in corpore & Sanguine Domini accipimus. *Auguſtin.* contr. Lit. Petiliani L. II c. 37.

h *Coloſſ.* II. 11.

i Hence *Miſſa Catechumenorum*, and *Miſſa Fidelium*. See *Cangius*'s Gloſſarium in *Miſſa*. And *Caſaubon.* Exercit. XVI. n. 59. p. 418. alias 582.

for

for an *Aſſembly*, and for *Church Service*: So eaſily do Words ſhift their Senſe, and adopt new Ideas. From ſignifying Church-Service in general, it came at length to denote the *Communion-Service* in particular, and ſo That moſt emphatically came to be called *The Maſs*. St. *Ambroſe* is reaſonably ſuppoſed to be the earlieſt Writer now extant, who mentions *Maſs* in that emphatical Senſe [k]. Higher Authorities have been pretended: But they are either from the ſpurious *Decretal* Epiſtles, or from *Liturgical* Offices of *modern* Date in compariſon [l].

So much for the *ancient Names* of the Sacrament: Not that I took upon me to number up all, but Thoſe only which appeared to me moſt conſiderable. More may be ſeen in *Hoſpinian*, *Caſaubon*, *Suicer*, or *Turretin*, collected into one View, with their proper Authorities. It is Time for me now to proceed directly to the Conſideration of the *Sacrament* itſelf; in the mean while hoping that my Readers will excuſe it, if I have hitherto detained them too long in the *Preliminaries*, intended to open and clear the Way to the main Subject.

k Miſſam facere cœpi. *Ambroſ.* Epiſt. 20. ad Marcellin. p. 853. Ed. Bened.

l Compare *Deylingius*. Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 262. 272. &c. *Bingham*. B. XIII. Ch. 1.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Inſtitution of the Holy Communion.

IT will be proper to begin with the *Inſtitution* of this Sacrament by Chriſt our Lord, as recorded by St. *Matthew*, St. *Mark*, St. *Luke*, and St. *Paul*. It is an Argument of the great Weight and Importance of it, that we have it *four* Times recorded in the New Teſtament, only with ſome ſlight Variations, while what one or more omit, another ſupplies. The moſt complete as well as ſhorteſt View of the whole may be taken by throwing all into one, in ſome ſuch Manner as here follows.

Matth. XXVI. *Mark* XIV. *Luke* XXII. 1 *Cor.* XI.

" The Night in which the *Lord Jeſus* was " betrayed, as they were eating, or did eat, " Jeſus took Bread, and giving Thanks, bleſs- " ed it, and brake it, and gave it unto his Diſ- " ciples, and ſaid; *Take, eat, this is my Body,* " *which is given and broken for you*; *Do this in* " *Remembrance of me.* After Supper likewiſe, " having taken the Cup, and given Thanks, " He gave it to them ſaying, *Drink ye all of* " *This, For, This Cup is my Blood of the new Co-* " *venant, the new Covenant in my Blood, which* " *is ſhed for you, for many, for the Remiſſion of* " *Sins: This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Re-* " *membrance of me* (and they all drank of it) " *Verily*

" *Verily, I ſay unto you, I will drink no more of* CHAP.
" *This Fruit of the Vine, until that Day, when* II.
" *I ſhall drink it new with you, in the Kingdom*
" *of my Father, in the Kingdom of God.* And
" when they had ſung an Hymn, they went
" out to the Mount of Olives.

THE Circumſtance of *Time* is the firſt Thing here obſervable: It was *in the Night in which he was betrayed*[m], that our Lord inſtituted this Holy Sacrament. Our Lord deſigned it (beſides other Uſes) for a ſtanding *Memorial* of his *Paſſion:* And to ſhew the more plainly, that He did ſo, or to render it the more affecting, He delayed the *Inſtitution* to the laſt Period of his Life.

A MORE material Circumſtance is, that He began the Inſtitution *as they were eating*, or after they had been eating: Here the Queſtion is, what had they been *eating?* It is commonly ſuppoſed, the *Paſchal Lamb.* For, St. *Matthew* in the ſame Chapter relates that on the firſt Day of *unleavened* Bread, the Diſciples came and aſked, *where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the Paſſover?* and the Lord made Anſwer that He would *keep the Paſſover with his Diſciples*, and the Diſciples actually prepared the Paſſover [n]. St. *Mark* reports the ſame [o]. St. *Luke* confirms it, and adds this further Circumſtance, that our Lord upon his ſitting down to Supper, ſaid, *with Deſire have*

m 1 *Cor.* XI. 23.
n *Matt.* XXVI. 17, 18, 19.
o *Mark* XIV. 12.——16.

I deſired

CHAP. II.

I deſired to eat this Paſſover with you, before I ſuffer[p]. Nevertheleſs, it ſeems from St. *John*'s Account, that the Day of the legal *Paſſover* was not yet come, that it was *before the Feaſt of the Paſſover* that our Lord had his *Supper*[q]; that Part of Friday, Paſſion-Day, was but the *Preparation*[r] of the Paſchal Feaſt. Theſe ſeeming Differences have occaſioned very long and intricate Diſputes between *Greeks* and *Latins*, and among learned Men both ancient and modern, which remain even to this Day. I ſhall not preſume to take the Place of a Moderator in ſo nice a Debate, but ſhall be content to report as much as may ſerve to give the Reader ſome Notion of it, ſufficient for my preſent Purpoſe. There are three ſeveral Schemes or Opinions in this Matter. 1. The moſt *ancient*, and moſt *prevailing* is, that our Lord kept the *legal* Paſſover, and on the *ſame Day* with the Jews: And thoſe who are in this Sentiment, have their probable *Solutions* with reſpect to St. *John*'s Accounts, while they claim the three other Evangeliſts as entirely Theirs. 2. The ſecond Opinion is, that our Lord *anticipated* (for weighty Reaſons) the *Time* of the Jewiſh Paſſover, and ſo kept His before Theirs: Or rather, He kept his Paſſover at the true *legal* Time, when the Jews (or ſome at leaſt of the Jews) poſtponed theirs *illegally*. This Opinion has alſo its *Difficulties*, and

p *Luke* XXII. 15.
q *John* XIII. 1, 2.
r *John* XIX. 14. Compare XVIII. 28.

the

the Maintainers of it have contrived ſome plau- CHAP.
ſible *Solutions*. 3. The third Opinion is, that II.
our Lord kept no *Paſſover* properly ſo called,
but had a *Supper*, and afterwards inſtituted the
Euchariſt, the *myſtical* or *Chriſtian* Paſſover;
called *Paſſover* in ſuch a Senſe as *Baptiſm* is
called *Circumciſion*, ſucceeding in its Room.
This laſt Opinion had ſome Patrons of old
Time, and more of late, and ſeems to gain
Ground. I ſhall here tranſcribe what a learned
and judicious Writer of our own has lately
pleaded in Behalf of it, though it may be
thought ſomewhat prolix. It is in his Notes
on *Matt.* XXVI. 17 [f].

" HERE occurs a Queſtion and a Diffe-
" rence between the Words of St. *John* and
" the other *Three* concerning the Day of the
" Week on which the Jews kept the Paſſover
" that Year 4746. A. D. 33. It is plain by
" all the four Goſpels, that this Day on which
" Chriſt did at Night eat the *Paſſover* (or what
" ſome *call* the Paſſover) was Thurſday. And
" one would think by reading the *Three*, that
" That was the Night on which the *Jews* did
" eat their *Paſſover-Lamb*. But all the Texts
" of St. *John* are clear, that they did not eat
" it till the next Night, *Friday-Night*, before
" which Night Chriſt was crucified and dead,
" having given up the Ghoſt about the ninth
" Hour, *viz.* three of the Clock in the After-
" noon. St. *John* does ſpeak of a *Supper* which

[f] Dr. *Wall*'s Critical Notes on the New Teſtament. p. 33.

CHAP. II.

" Chriſt did eat on *Thurſday-Night* with his " Apoſtles, Ch. XIII. 1, 2. But He does not " call it a *Paſſover-Supper*, but on the contrary " ſays it was *before the Feaſt of the Paſſover*, " πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα: By which, I think " he means *the Day before the Paſſover*, or the " *Paſſover-Eve* as we ſhould ſay. Now, this " was the *ſame Night*, and the *ſame Supper* " which the *Three* do call the *Paſſover* and " Chriſt's *eating the Paſſover*. I mean, it was " the Night on which Chriſt was (a few Hours " after Supper) apprehended; as is plain by " the laſt Verſe of that XIII*th* Chapter. But " the next Day (*Friday*, on which Chriſt was " crucified) St. *John* makes to be the *Paſſover-* " *Day*. He ſays (Ch. XVIII. 28.) the Jews " would not go into the Judgment-Hall on " *Friday-Morning*, leſt they ſhould be defiled, " but that they might *eat the Paſſover*, viz. " that Evening. And Ch. XIX. 14. ſpeaking " of *Friday-noon*, he ſays, it was the *Prepara-* " *tion of the Paſſover*. Upon the whole, *John* " ſpeaks not of eating the *Paſſover* at all: Nor " indeed do the *Three* ſpeak of his eating any " *Lamb*. Among all the Expreſſions which they " uſe, *of making ready the Paſſover*; *prepare* " *for Thee to eat the Paſſover*; *with Deſire have* " *I deſired to eat this Paſſover with you*, &c. " There is no mention of any *Lamb* carried " to the *Temple* to be ſlain by the *Levites*, and " then brought to the Houſe and roaſted: " There is no mention of any Food at the " Supper beſide Bread and Wine: Perhaps " there

" there might be bitter Herbs. So that this CHAP.
" ſeems to have been a *commemorative Supper* II.
" uſed by our Saviour inſtead of the proper
" *Paſchal Supper*, the eating of a Lamb; which
" ſhould have been the next Night but that
" He Himſelf was to be ſacrificed before that
" Time would come. And the Difference be-
" tween St. *John* and the *other*, is only a Dif-
" ference in *Words*, and in the *Names* of
" Things: They call That the *Paſſover*, which
" Chriſt uſed *inſtead* of it.

" IF you ſay, why then does *Mark* XIV.
" 12. call *Thurſday* the *Firſt Day* of *unleavened*
" Bread, when they *killed the Paſſover*, and
" *Luke* XXII. 7. the Day of *unleavened* Bread
" when the *Paſſover muſt be killed*; we muſt
" note, that their Day (or νυχθήμερον) was from
" *Evening* to *Evening*. This Thurſday-Even-
" ing was the *Beginning* of that natural Day
" of 24 Hours, towards the *End* of which the
" *Lamb* was to be killed: So it is proper in
" the Jews Way of calling Days to call it
" That Day. Thus far Dr. *Wall*.

Deylingius, a learned Lutheran, has more minutely canvaſſed the ſame Queſtion, and maintained the ſame Side [t]. I ſhall not take upon me to ſay poſitively which of the three Opinions is the beſt, or clogged with feweſt Difficulties. If the laſt of the Three be preferred,

t *Deylingius* Obſervat. Sacr. Tom. I. p. 233. ——— 249. *Lipſiæ* 1720. Compare his *Obſervationes Miſcellaneæ*. Lipſ. 1736. where He again ſtrongly maintains the ſame Opinion, from p. 239. to p. 248.

then

CHAP. II.

then the Euchariſt is as properly the *Chriſtian Paſſover*, as Baptiſm is the *Chriſtian Circumciſion*; and we have the Authority of our Lord himſelf, or of his Diſciples, for ſo calling it, if They gave that *Name* to the whole Tranſaction. But whatever *Hypotheſis* we follow, there will be Proof ſufficient that the *Euchariſt* ſucceeded in the Room of the *Paſſover*, like as *Baptiſm* ſucceeded in the Room of *Circumciſion*.

IT appears to be well agreed among the Learned of all Parties, that the Chriſtian *Euchariſt* ſucceeded in the Place of the Jewiſh *Paſſover:* And good Uſe has been often made of the Obſervation, for the explaining the *Nature* of the Euchariſt, as well as the *Phraſe* of the Inſtitution. *Buxtorf* has labour'd with moſt Advantage in this Argument in his two Tracts, (one againſt *Scaliger*[u], and the other againſt *Cappellus*[w]) and has ſo exhauſted the Subject, eſpecially as to what concerns the *Forms* and *Phraſes*, that He ſeems to have left but ſmall Gleanings for Thoſe that come after Him. Yet ſome additional Improvements have been ſince thrown in by learned Hands[x]. The *reſembling* Circumſtances common to the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian Paſſover* may be divided into two Kinds: Some relating to the *Things* themſelves, ſome to the *Phraſes* and *Forms* made uſe of

u *Buxtorf.* Diſſertat. VI. de Cœnæ Dominicæ primæ Ritibus & Forma.

w Vindiciæ Exercitat. de Cœna Domini adv. Lud. Cappel. p. 338. &c.

x *Pfaffius* de Oblat. vet. Euchariſt. p. 165. &c.
Bucherus. Antiqu. Biblicæ p. 360. &c.

here

here and there. It may not be improper to preſent the Reader with a brief detail of thoſe *reſembling* Circumſtances. CHAP. II.

I. OF the firſt Sort are theſe: 1. The Paſſover was of *divine* Appointment, and ſo is the Euchariſt. 2. The Paſſover was a *Sacrament*, and ſo is the Euchariſt. 3. The Paſſover was a *Memorial* [y] of a great Deliverance from temporal Bondage; the Euchariſt is a *Memorial* of a *greater* Deliverance from *ſpiritual* Bondage. 4. The Paſſover *prefigured* the Death of Chriſt [z], before it was accompliſhed, the Euchariſt *repreſents*, or *figures* out our Lord's Death now paſt. 5. The Paſſover was a kind of *Federal* Rite between God and Man, ſo alſo is the Euchariſt. 6. As no one was to eat of the Paſſover before he had been *circumciſed* [a], ſo no one is to partake of the Euchariſt before he has been *baptized*. 7. As the Jews were obliged to come *clean* to the Paſſover [b], ſo are Chriſtians obliged to come well *prepared* to the Communion [c]. 8. As ſlight *Defilements* (where there was no *Contempt*) did not *debar* a Man from the Paſſover, nor *excuſe* his Neglect of it [d], ſo neither do ſmaller Offences, where there is an *honeſt* Heart, either forbid, or excuſe a Man's abſenting from This Sacrament. 9. As a *total* Contempt, or Neglect of the Paſſover

y *Exod.* XII. 14. XIII. 9. *Deut.* XVI. 3.
z Vid. *Vitringa* Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. I. L. II. c. 9. p. 415, &c.
a *Exod.* XII. 43. — 48. b *Num.* IX. 6.
c 1 *Cor.* XI. 27, 28, 29.
d *Num.* IX. 10. —— 2 *Chron.* XXX. 18.

CHAP. II. was Crime great enough to render the Offender liable to be *cut off from Iſrael* [e], ſo a total Contempt or Neglect of the Holy Communion, is in Effect, to be *cut off* from Chriſtianity. 10. As the Paſſover was to *continue* as long as the *Jewiſh* Law ſhould ſtand in Force, ſo muſt the Euchariſt *abide* as long as Chriſtianity [f]. I have thrown theſe Articles together in a ſhort Compaſs for the preſent, only to give the Reader a brief *general* View of the *Analogy* between thoſe two Sacraments; and not that he ſhould take the Truth of every Particular for granted, without *farther Proof*, if any Thing of Moment ſhould be hereafter built upon any of them.

II. THE other Sort of *reſembling* Circumſtances concern the particular *Forms* and *Phraſes* made uſe of in the *Inſtitution:* And it is in theſe chiefly that the great Maſters of *Jewiſh* Antiquities, before referred to, have obliged the *Chriſtian* World. I ſhall offer a ſhort Summary of theſe likewiſe.

1. IN the *Paſchal* Supper, the Maſter of the Houſe *took Bread* and *bleſſed* it in a Prayer of Thankſgiving to God: And the Rule was, never to begin the Bleſſing till he had the Bread *in Hand*, that ſo the Prayer of Benediction directed to God, might at the ſame Time be underſtood to have *Relation* to the *Bread*,

e *Exod.* XII. 15. *Num.* IX. 13. Confer. *Bucher.* Antiqu. p. 402.

f 1 *Cor.* XI. 26.

and

and might draw down a *Bleſſing upon it*[g]. It is obvious to ſee how applicable all this is to our Lord's Conduct in the firſt Article of the *Inſtitution.* CHAP. II.

2. THE *breaking* of the Bread, after Benediction, was a cuſtomary Practice in the Jewiſh Feaſts[h]: Only in the *Paſchal* Feaſt, it is ſaid, that the Bread was firſt *broken* and the Benediction followed[i]. But whether our Lord varied *then*, in a ſlight Circumſtance, or the *Jews* have varied *ſince*, may remain a Queſtion.

3. THE *diſtributing* the Bread to the Company, after the *Benediction* and *Fraction*, was cuſtomary among the *Jews*[k]: And here likewiſe our Lord was pleaſed to adopt the like Ceremony.

SEVERAL learned Men have ſuggeſted[l], that the Words *This is my Body* might be illuſtrated from ſome old Jewiſh Forms made uſe of in the Paſſover-Feaſt; as, *This is the Bread of Affliction* &c. and *This is the Body of* the *Paſſover*: But *Buxtorf* (who beſt underſtood theſe Matters) after conſidering once and again, conſtantly rejected the former, and demurred to

g See *Pfaffius* de Oblat. vet. Euchariſt. p. 171, &c.
Bucherus Antiq. Evangel. p. 368, &c.
Buxtorf. de Cœna Domini, p. 310.

h *Buxtorf.* 313. *Bucherus*, 372.

i *Lightfoot.* Temple Service Ch. XIII. §. 7. p. 964. and on *Matt.* XXVI. 26. p. 259. *Pfaffius*, p. 178.

k *Buxtorf.* 316. *Bucherus*, 374.

l See particularly *Pfaffius* de Oblat. p. 179. And *Deylingius* (Miſcellan. Sacr. p. 228, &c.) who refers to ſuch *Authors* as have eſpouſed the *firſt* of the Inſtances, after *Baronius* and *Scaliger.*

CHAP. II.

the other Inſtance[m], as not *pertinent*, or not *early* enough to anſwer the Purpoſe: And *Bucherus*[n], who has carefully re-examin'd the ſame, paſſes the like *doubtful* Judgment; or rather rejects Both the Inſtances as *improper*, not being found among the Jewiſh *Rituals*, or being too *late* to come into Account. So I paſs them by. *Juſtin Martyr*, I cannot tell how, was perſuaded, that *Eſdras*, at a Paſſover, had ſaid to the Jews, *This Paſſover* (i. e. Paſchal Lamb) *is our Saviour and our Refuge*[o], and that the *Jews* after Chriſt's Time, had eraſed the Paſſage out of the *Septuagint*. He was certainly miſtaken in his Report: But the Words are worth the obſerving, as diſcovering what the Chriſtians in his Time thought of the *Paſſover*, as a *Type* of Chriſt, and how they underſtood *Paſchal* Phraſes, parallel to *This is my Body* &c.

4. THE Words, *This do in Remembrance of me*, making Part of the *Inſtitution*, are reaſonably judged to allude to the ancient *Paſchal* Solemnities, in which were ſeveral *Memorials*[p]: And the Service itſelf is more than once called a *Memorial* in the Old Teſtament, as before noted.

m *Buxtorf* Diſſert. VI. de Cœna. p. 301. Diſſert. VII. Vindic. p. 347, 348.

n *Bucherus* Antiq. Evangel. p. 375, 278. Compare *Deylingius* (Miſcellan. Sacr. p. 228, &c.) who abſolutely rejects one, and doubts of the other.

o Καὶ εἶπεν Εσδρας τῷ λαῷ, τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν. *Juſt. Mart.* Dial. p. 292. Edit. *Thirlby*. Conf. *Wolfius* 1 *Cor.* V. 7.

p Ἀνάμνησις ritus Hebræorum redolet: Habebant namque Judæi, in celebratione *Agni Paſchalis*, plures ejuſmodi ἀναμνήσεις & Recordationes &c. *Bucherus*, p. 379.

CHAP. II.

5. In the ancient *Paſchal*-Feaſt, the Maſter of the Houſe was wont to take Cup after Cup (to the Number of *four)* into his Hands, conſecrating them one after another by a ſhort Thankſgiving; after which each conſecrated Cup was called a *Cup of Bleſſing*. It is judg'd by the learned in Jewiſh Antiquities[r], that the *Third* or *Fourth* Cup *(Buxtorf* is poſitive for the *Fourth)* was what our Lord was pleaſed to ſanctify, by taking it into his Hand, and giving Thanks over it. It is doubted, what the Words *after Supper mean*; whether, *in the cloſe* of the Paſchal Supper, as ſome think[s], or *after they had eaten Bread*, as others conſtrue[t]: But the Difference is not of Moment, and ſo I paſs on.

6. AT the Inſtitution of the Paſſover it was ſaid, *The Blood ſhall be to you for a Token upon the Houſes where you are; and when I ſee the*

r *Pfaffius* de Oblat. Euch. p. 173.
Buxtorf. in Lexic. Talmud. p. 614, 616. Diſſert. VI. p. 300.
Lightfoot on *Matt.* XXVI. 27. p. 259.
Bucherus, p. 380 —— 384. *Zornius* opuſc. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 14, &c.
Hooper on Lent, Part II. c. 3. p. 173.

s *Lightfoot*, p. 259, 260.

t Τὸ μετὰ δειπνῆσαι [1 Cor. XI. 25.] non vertendum eſt, *poſt cœnam communem*, qualis nunquam fuit, ſed *remote poſt Cœnam Paſchalem:* Vel, quod vero ſimilius eſt, proxime & immediate *poſt eſum panis conſecrati*; cui expoſitioni reſpondet Recenſio Hiſtorica Luc. XXII. 20. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, *poſtquam comederant*, ſcil. *Panem conſecratum*, quam verſionem ſequuntur *Arabs* & *Perſa*. Sic Græcis δεῖπνον quidem ἰδίως *cœnam*, ſed παχυλῶς & καταχρηστικῶς ſæpe *cibum* & quodvis *epulum* connotat; qua notione *Heſiodus* dixit δεῖπνον ποιεῖν, *comedere*, cibum ſumere &c. *Bucher.* p. 362.

CHAP. II.

Blood, I will paſs over you, and the Plague ſhall not be upon you [u], &c. The *Blood* was the *Token* of the Covenant in that Behalf, between *God* and his *People*; as Circumciſion before had been a *Token* [w] alſo of a like *Covenant*, and called *Covenant* [x], as well as *Token*. In the Inſtitution of the *Communion*, our Lord ſays, *this Cup is the new Covenant in my Blood which is ſhed for you, for many, for the Remiſſion of Sins*. The *Cup* is here by a Figure put for *Wine*: And *Covenant*, according to ancient Scripture-Phraſe, is put for *Token* of a Covenant; and Wine, *Repreſentative* of Chriſt's Blood, anſwers to the Blood of the Paſſover, *typical* of the ſame Blood of Chriſt [y]: And the *Remiſſion of Sins* here, anſwers to the *paſſing over* there, and preſerving from *Plague*. Theſe ſhort Hints may ſuffice at preſent, juſt to intimate the *Analogy* between the Jewiſh Paſſover, and the Chriſtian Euchariſt, in the ſeveral Particulars of Moment here mentioned.

u *Exod.* XII. 13. w *Gen.* XVII. 11.

x *Gen.* XVII. 10. *This is my Covenant* &c. and v. 13. my *Covenant* ſhall be in your Fleſh &c.

y Deus ſpeciali mandato *Sacrificia* & *Primitias* offerendas ordinavit, maxime *effuſionem Sanguinis*, ut ab initio homines haberent unde *effuſionis* per *Chriſtum tacite* recordari poſſent. *Dan.* IX. 24. *Heb.* IX. & X. *Rom.* III. Præter cæteras oblationes Deo factas, commemorabilia ſunt Sacrificia in Feſto *Expiationum* — Tum quoque Sacrificium *Agni Paſchalis*, & *Quotidiani*, ſeu *jugis Sacrificii*, attendi debet. *Hos* igitur ad *ritus* & *oblationes* alludit Chriſtus cum ait, Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Obſervant præterea viri docti *vinum ruſum*, quale in illis regionibus creſcebat, ac in primis in *Cœna Paſchali* bibebatur, egregiam nobis *Sanguinis* memoriam relinquere. *Eucher.* Antiq. Evang. p. 389.

7. AT

CHAP. II.

7. AT the Paſchal Feaſt, there was an *Annunciation*, or *Declaration* [z] of the great Things which God had done for that People: In like Manner, one Deſign of the Euchariſt, is to make a *Declaration* of the Mercies of God in Chriſt, to *ſhew the Lord's Death till He come.*

8. LASTLY, at the Cloſe of the Paſchal Supper, they were wont to ſing an *Hymn* [a] of Praiſe: And the like was obſerved in the Cloſe of the *Inſtitution* of the Chriſtian Euchariſt; as is recorded in the Goſpels.

THE many *reſembling* Circumſtances, real and verbal, which I have here briefly enumerated, do abundantly ſhew, that this *Holy Euchariſt* was in a great meaſure copied from the *Paſchal Feaſt*, and was intended to *ſupply its Place*, only heightening the Deſign, and improving the Application. The Uſe of the Obſervation may appear afterwards, when we come to conſider more minutely either the *general* Intent, or the particular *Parts* of this Chriſtian Service.

CHAP. III.

Of the Commemoration, or Remembrance of Chriſt in the Holy Communion.

SINCE the *End*, or *Deſign* of any Thing, is always conſidered as *firſt* in *View*, antecedent in natural order to the Performance, ſo the Rules of juſt Method require, that in

z See *Lightfoot*, Vol. II. p. 778. *Pfaffius*, p. 181.
a See *Lightfoot*, Vol. II. p. 258, 260. *Pfaffius*, 181.

CHAP. III.

treating of this Sacrament, we ſhould begin with ſome Account of the proximate *End* and *Deſign* of it; namely, the *Commemoration* or *Remembrance* of Chriſt, *This do in Remembrance of me*[b]; and particularly of his *Death* and *Paſſion*: *ſhew the Lord's Death* till He come[c]. I call it the *proximate* or immediate End, becauſe the *ultimate* End of all is the *Happineſs of Man*, or what is coincident therewith, the *Glory of God*. Our bleſſed Lord ſeeks not his *own* Glory, but the *Good* of his Creatures, in all that He appoints them to do. He is not capable of receiving *Advantage*, or any *real* Addition to his own *Glory*, by any of our *Commemorations*, or *Services*: But all theſe Things are graciouſly appointed for our preſent and future *Benefit*; and we may be confident that Chriſt, the Captain of our Salvation, would preſcribe nothing in a *particular* Manner, which does not as *particularly* contribute to that End. Some Divines, of a refined and elevated Way of thinking, will not allow that God can have any *End* but *Himſelf*, in any Thing that He does, becauſe He can have no *higher*: But then they do not mean, that God propoſes to Himſelf any *Increaſe* of Happineſs, or of *eſſential* Glory, to which nothing can be *added*; but that, as He is naturally *benevolent*, and as He takes delight in his *own* Being and Attributes (the moſt

b *Luke* XXII. 19. 1 *Cor.* XI. 24, 25. Τῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

c 1 *Cor.* XI. 26. Τὸν θάνατον τῦ κυρίυ καταγγέλλετε ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ.

worthy

worthy of his Love) ſo He delights in the *Exerciſe* of his Goodneſs, and chooſes it as worthy of *Himſelf*, and, in this Senſe, acts only for Himſelf. In ſuch a Senſe as this, our bleſſed Lord may be ſaid to have acted for *Himſelf*, or for his *own Glory*, in what He did for Mankind: But it can in no Senſe be allowed, that he receives any *Advantage* by what *we ſay*, or *do*; and therefore the *ultimate* End (ſo conſidered) of our Commemorations, or Services, is the *Benefit* accruing from thence to *ourſelves:* What they are, we ſhall ſee in due Time and Place. This being premiſed for clearer Conception, or to prevent Miſtakes, I now proceed. CHAP. III.

THE Commemoration of *our Lord's dying for us*, includes two Things; the Conſideration of him as *Lord*, and as *dying*; one expreſſing his *Perſonal Dignity*, the other expreſſing his *meritorious* Sufferings, relative to us. The *firſt* of the two may ſuffice for the preſent: The *ſecond* may be reſerv'd for a diſtinct Chapter,

I HERE take for my Ground, the Words of our Lord: *This do in Remembrance of me.* The Greek words εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, may bear three ſeveral Rendrings (or four). 1. *In Remembrance of me.* 2. *In Commemoration of me.* 3. *For a Memorial of me*, or, (*for my Memorial.*) They differ not *much* in Senſe, but yet as they do *differ*, they may deſerve a *diſtinct* Conſideration. The *Second* includes the Firſt; and the *Third* includes both the former, not *vice verſa:* So they riſe as it were in Senſe, and are

ſo

CHAP. III.

ſo many diſtinct Gradations, as ſhall be ſhewn preſently.

1. I BEGIN with the firſt and loweſt, this do *in Remembrance of me*. The *Socinians* (ſome of them at leaſt) not content with ſuppoſing this *Remembrance* or *Commemoration* to be *one* conſiderable *End* or Part of this Sacrament, make it to be the *only* End or Uſe of it [d]; yea and ſometimes go ſo far as to ſay, that it conſtitutes the very *Nature* or *Eſſence* of this Holy Rite: For, They interpret the Words, *This is my Body*, ſo as to mean, this *Action*, this eating and drinking, is the *Memorial* of Chriſt's Body broken [e] &c. Which is over doing, and neglecting to diſtinguiſh between the *Thing* itſelf, and the *End* or *Deſign* of it; between what is done, and for what Purpoſe it is done. We eat Bread and we drink Wine in the Sacrament, the Symbols of Chriſt's Body and Blood; and we do ſo for this Reaſon, among others, that Chriſt may be *remembred*, and the *Merits* of his Paſſion celebrated. But this I hint by the way only, and paſs on to what I

d Et hæc quidem quam explicuimus, *mortis Chriſti annuntiatio* proprius eſt, atque *unicus* Cœnæ Dominicæ finis &c.
Volkel. de Cœn. Dom. p. 687.

e Hæc *Actio* frangendi & comedendi panem, eſt *corpus*, hoc eſt *commemoratio* Chriſti corporis pro nobis fracti.
Smale. cont. Frantz. p. 315.

Corpus Chriſti & Sanguinem Chriſti pro *memoriali ſigno* Corporis Chriſti fracti, & Sanguinis fuſi ſumimus: *Commemorationem* autem, iſtius ſacri ritus *Finem uſumque* eſſe dicimus. *Schlinting.* contr. Meiſn. p. 761. Ritus iſtius *naturam* in panis fractione & eſu, & e poculo potu, perque hæc in mortis Chriſti *Repreſentatione* quadam, ſitam eſſe dicimus. *Ibid.* p. 785, 786.

deſign,

CHAP. III.

deſign. *Remembrance* of Chriſt is undoubtedly a *principal* End of this Sacrament. It is not declared by the *Inſtitution* itſelf, in what View, or under what Capacity we are here to remember Him; But that muſt be learned from other Places of Scripture, which declare *who*, and *what* He is: For, certainly we are to *remember* Him in ſuch a Light as the *Old* and *New* Teſtament have repreſented Him in. This appears to be an allowed Principle on all hands: For, none think themſelves obliged to ſtop in the bare Words of the *Inſtitution*, without carrying their Enquiries farther into the whole compaſs of Scripture, when they ſee proper. The *Socinians* themſelves will not ſcruple to allow that Chriſt may, or ought to be *remembred* in the Sacrament as *Lord*, in their Senſe, or as *Maſter*, or *Saviour*, or *Head*, or *Judge*, tho' there is not a Word of *Lord*, or *Maſter*, or *Saviour*, or *Head*, or *Judge*, in the bare Form of *Inſtitution* as delivered by Chriſt: But thoſe Names or Titles are to be fetched from other Places of Scripture. Therefore, I ſay, it is allowed by all Parties, that we ought to remember Chriſt, in the Holy Communion, according to *what He is*, by the Scripture-Account of Him. This Foundation being laid, I go on to the Superſtructure: And for the more diſtinct Conception of what this *Remembrance* implies, or contains, I ſhall take leave to proceed by ſeveral Steps, or Degrees.

1. IT is not ſufficient to remember Chriſt merely as a very *great* and *good* Man, a *wiſe* Inſtructor,

CHAP. III. Inſtructor, and an *admirable* Teacher, while He lived, received up into celeſtial *Bliſs* and *Glory*, when He died: For all this comes vaſtly ſhort of what *ſacred Writ* declares of Him; and is indeed no more (if ſo much) than what the *Pagans* themſelves, the *Platoniſts* particularly of the *ſecond* and *third* Centuries, were ready to admit. For, being ſtruck with the Fame of his undoubted *Miracles*, and with the inimitable Force of his admirable *Precepts*, *Holy* Life, and *exemplary* Death, they could not but revere and honour his *Memory*; neither could they refuſe to aſſign him a Place among their chief *Sages*, or *Deities*[f]. And all the Plea they had left for not receiving Chriſtianity, was, that his *Diſciples* (as was pretended) had revolted, or degenerated, and had not duly obſerved the wholeſome Inſtructions of their High Leader[g]. Thoſe Pagan *Philoſophers* there-

f See this particularly proved, in a very learned and curious Diſſertation, written by *Laurence Moſheim*, and lately inſerted, with Improvements, into his *Latin* Tranſlation of *Cudworth*, Vol. II. *confer.* Euſeb. L. VII. c. 18. Chriſtum, Servatorem noſtrum, virum magnum, divinum, & ſapientiſſimum fuiſſe non inficiabantur, qui egregia & divina plane docuiſſet, cumque a Judæis injuſtiſſimo ſupplicio necatus fuiſſet, in Cœlum *ad Deos* commeaſſet. *Moſhem.* ibid. p. 23. Hence perhaps it was, that the Emperor *Alex. Severus* (of the third Century) along with the Images of *Apollonius*, and *Orpheus*, had others of *Abraham* and *Jeſus Chriſt*, receiving them as *Deities*. Lamprid. vit. Severi.

g Deſciviſſe ſcilicet a Sanctiſſimi præceptoris ſui ſcitis Chriſtianos *Platonici* criminabantur——atque caſtam & ſanam ejus Diſciplinam variis erroribus inquinaſſe.——1. quod *divinis* Chriſtum *honoribus* afficerent; nec enim a ſuis id poſtulaſſe Chriſtum. 2. Quod *Deos* negligerent, & eorum cultum extinctum vellent; Chriſtum enim ipſum a Diis haud alienum fuiſſe.

Moſhem. ibid. p. 24.

fore,

fore, as I ſaid, *remembred* Chriſt, in as *high* a View as this Article amounts to: A *Chriſtian* Remembrance muſt go a great deal *higher*. CHAP. III.

2. IT is not ſufficient to remember Chriſt merely as an eminent *Prophet* or one of the *chief* Prophets, an *Ambaſſador* from *Heaven*, and one that received his *Goſpel* from above, wrought *Miracles*, lived a good *Life*, was *deified* after Death, and will come again to *judge* Mankind: For all this the *Mahometans* themſelves (or ſome Sects amongſt them) can freely own, and They pay a ſuitable Regard to his *Memory* on that Score [h]. It is all vaſtly below what the Scriptures plainly teſtify of Him, and therefore does not amount to a *Chriſtian* Remembrance of Him.

3. NEITHER yet is it ſufficient to remember Chriſt as our *Head*, *Lord*, and *Maſter*, to whom we owe ſuch Regard as *Diſciples* do to their *Leader*, or *Founder*: For all this is no more than what the Jews juſtly aſcribed to *Moſes*, who was but the *Servant* of Chriſt [i]. And it is no more than what many *nominal* Chriſtians, ancient and modern, many Half-Believers, have owned, and what all but declared *Apoſtates* or *Infidels* muſt own. And it comes not up to what the Scriptures fully and frequently teach, and therefore does not amount to a *due* Remembrance of Him.

h See *Reland.* de Religione Mohammedica. p. 25, 33, 34, 44, 45, 212, 224. *David Millius.* Differt. X. de Mohammediſmo, p. 344, 345, 346.

i *Heb.* III. 2.——6.

4. NEITHER,

CHAP. III.

4. NEITHER, laſtly, is it ſufficient to remember Chriſt as *higher* than the *Angels*, or *older* than the Syſtem of the World: For, that is not more than many *Misbelievers*, of former or of later Times, have made no Scruple to own, and it is ſtill *ſhort* of the Scripture Accounts.

FOR, according to the whole Tenour both of Old and New Teſtament, Jeſus Chriſt is not merely our *Lord*, *Maſter*, *Judge*, &c. but our *Divine* Lord and Maſter; *Lord* in ſuch a Senſe as to be *Jehovah* and *God of Iſrael*, God before the Creation, and by whom *all* Creatures were made [k]; who *laid the Foundation of the Earth*, and even the *Heavens are the Works of his Hands* [l]. Who has a rightful Claim to be *worſhipped* and adored, by *Men*, by *Angels* [m], by the *whole Creation* [n]. And no wonder, ſince he is deſcribed in Sacred Writ, as *God with us* [o], as *Lord God* [p], *true God* [q], *great God* [r], *mighty God* [s], *over all God bleſſed for ever* [t]. Such is the Scripture Account of our bleſſed *Lord*, and his *Perſonal* Dignity; and therefore as ſuch we ought to *remember* Him as often as we think of Him, and more particularly at the *Communion Table*. For, ſince the *Value* of what our

k *John* I. 1, 2, 3.
l *Heb.* I. 10.
m *Hebr.* I. 6.
n *Revel.* V. 13.
o *Matt.* I. 23.
p *Luke* I. 16, 17.
q 1 *John* V. 20.
r *Tit.* II. 13.
s *Iſa.* IX. 6.
t *Rom.* IX. 5.

The Reader who deſires to ſee theſe ſeveral Texts explained, and Objections anſwered, may pleaſe to compare my *Eight Sermons*, and particularly the VIth.

Lord

Lord has done, or ſuffered, riſes in proportion to the *Dignity* of the Perſon ſo doing or ſuffering, it is manifeſt that we cannot *duly*, or *ſuitably* remember Him in the Sacrament, if we entertain not thoſe *high* and *honourable* Conceptions of Him, which ſuch his *Perſonal Dignity* Demands. If the ſending of the *only begotten Son* into the World, to ſuffer, bleed, and die for us, was really the higheſt Inſtance of *divine* Love which could poſſibly have been given: And if we are obliged, in return, to expreſs our Thankfulneſs in a way *ſuitable* thereto: And if ſuch a ſuitable return is altogether impracticable without a *juſt* Senſe of the Favour granted; and if no *juſt* Senſe can be had of it, while we take away the moſt endearing and enforcing Conſideration, which moſt of all enhances the *Value* of it: If theſe *Premiſes* be true, the *Concluſion* is plain and neceſſary, that as often as we *remember* Chriſt in the Euchariſt, we ought to remember Him not barely as a *wiſe* Man, or a *good* Man, or an eminent *Prophet*, or *chief Martyr*, or as our particular *Maſter*, or *Founder*, or *Redeemer*, but as an *almighty* Saviour and Deliverer, as the *only-begotten* of the Father, *very God of very God*, of the ſame *divine* Nature, of *Glory equal*, of *Majeſty coeternal*. He that remembers Him in any *lower* Senſe than This, in *oppoſition* to This, is not worthy of Him; neither can He be eſteem'd by ſober and diſcerning Chriſtians, as a worthy Partaker of the Holy Communion.

CHAP. III.

To

CHAP. III.

To confirm this Reaſoning drawn from Scripture-Texts, I ſhall ſubjoin ſome *human*, but very *ancient* Authorities. They are what all Writers, ſo far as I can perceive, in ſome degree value, and think it an *Honour* to have, if they can but contrive any colourable Pretenſions to them[u]: And it is only when Diſappointment makes them deſpair, that they affect to contemn, what they cannot arrive to. *Juſtin Martyr* is a very early Writer, born about the Year 89 (as appears probable) and writing within 40 or 50 Years of the lateſt Apoſtle. It is worth the while, to know what ſo early and ſo conſiderable a Perſon thought of a *Chriſtian Sacrament*, which he had ſo often frequented; eſpecially when he gives us a formal, ſolemn Account of it, in the Name of his *Chriſtian Brethren*, and in an Addreſs to the Emperor. "This "Food we call the *Euchariſt*, of which none "are allow'd to be Partakers but ſuch only "as are *true Believers*, and have been baptized "in the *Laver of Regeneration* for the *Remiſ-* "*ſion of Sins*, and *live* according to Chriſt's *Pre-* "*cepts*. For, we do not take this as *common* "Bread and *common* Wine: But as Jeſus Chriſt "our Saviour was *made Fleſh* by the *Logos* of "God, and had *real* Fleſh and Blood for our "Salvation, ſo are we taught, that this Food, "which the very ſame *Logos* bleſſed by Prayer "and Thankſgiving, is turned into the Nou- "riſhment and Subſtance of our Fleſh and "Blood, and is in ſome Senſe the Fleſh and

[u] See my *Importance* p. 448, 449.

"Blood

" Blood of the *incarnate* Jeſus[w]. I choſe to follow Mr. *Reeves*'s Tranſlation of this Paſſage, tho' ſomewhat *paraphraſtical*, becauſe he has very well hit off the Senſe. What I have to obſerve upon it, as ſuitable to my preſent Purpoſe is, that particular Notice is twice taken of the *Incarnation* of the *Logos* (that is, of *God incarnate*, according to *Juſtin*'s known Doctrine of the *Logos* being *God*) and the Sacrament is not only ſuppoſed to be a *Commemoration*[x], but a kind of *Emblem* of it by *Juſtin*'s Account[y], as the intelligent Reader will obſerve. The Reaſon is, that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is the Sacrament of the *Paſſion*[z], and God the Son by becoming incarnate, firſt became *paſſible*. All which will be made plainer by another Paſſage of the ſame *Juſtin*, in his Dialogue with the *Jew*[a], which is as follows: " That Prayers and Thankſgivings, made by CHAP. III.

w *Juſtin. Martyr.* Apol. 1. c. 86. p. 96. Edit. *Thirlby. Reeves* Vol. 1. p. 120, 121.

x Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσαντ̓ αὐτὸν διὰ τὲς πιςεύοντας εἰς αὐτὸν δι᾽ οὓς καὶ παθητὸς γέγονε. Juſt. Mart Dial. p. 290.

y How this was underſtood, ſee explained in a *Charge* on the *Doctrinal Uſe* of the Sacraments. p. 25.

z Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους ὃ ἔπαθεν. Ibid. p. 220.

a Ὅτιμὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ, καὶ εὐχαριςίαι, ὑπὸ τ̃ ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρις οί εἰσι τῷ θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτὸς φημί. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ χριςιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὁ πέπονθε δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ μέμνηται. *Juſt. Mart.* Dial. p. 387.

A conjectural Emendation has been offered, directing us to read δι᾽ αὐτὲς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. *Mede* opp. p. 362. *Thirlby* in loc. I ſee not why ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ may not mean the ſame with ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ: Perhaps ἐκ might have been negligently dropp'd. The learned Editor ingenuouſly ſays; *iſtud* θεὸς *admodum ſanè invitus muto, propter ſequentia.*

CHAP. III.

" thoſe who are *worthy*, are the only *Sacri-*
" *fices* that are perfect and well pleaſing to
" God, I alſo affirm: For theſe are the only
" ones which Chriſtians have been taught to
" perform even in that *Remembrance* [or Me-
" morial] of their Food both dry and liquid,
" wherein alſo is commemorated the *Paſſion*
" which *God of God* ſuffered in his own Perſon,
" [or, *for them.*] I have no need to take notice here of more than is to my preſent Purpoſe, The Words *God of God* are what I point to, as a Proof that the *Divinity* of Chriſt was an important Article of the Euchariſtical *Remembrance*. If any ſhould incline to read *Son of God* (upon conjecture, for it is no more) inſtead of *God of God*, in that Place, it will ſtill amount to the ſame, becauſe *Juſtin* always underſtood the Phraſe of *Son of God* in the higheſt and ſtrongeſt Senſe, as meaning *God of God*[b]. But I ſee no neceſſity of admitting any new *conjectural* Change of ὁ θεὸς into ὁ υἱὸς, ſince θεὸς is very frequently our Lord's Title in *Juſtin*[c], yea and ὁ θεὸς more than once[d]. But I proceed.

I SHALL ſubjoin a Paſſage of *Origen*, containing the like elevated Sentiments of the Remembrance made in the Holy Communion. " Thou that art come to Chriſt (the true High
" Prieſt, who by his Blood has reconcil'd God

b Ὃς καὶ λόγῳ πρωτοτόκῳ ὢν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ θεὸς ὑπάρχει. p. 94. conf. 406. 408. 411.

c Juſt. Mart. p. 204. 210. 233. 250. 261. 263. 265. 273. 291. 303. 328. 408. 409.

d Juſt. Mart. p. 251. 326. 378.

" to

" to Thee, and Thee to the Father) reſt not CHAP.
" in the Blood of the Fleſh, but conſider ra- III.
" ther, *the Blood of the Logos*, and hear Him de-
" claring, *This is my Blood which ſhall be ſhed for*
" *you, for Remiſſion of Sins:* The initiated in the
" Myſteries well underſtand both the Fleſh and
" the Blood of *God the Word*[e]. So I tranſlate the laſt Words, as moſt agreeable to *Origen*'s uſual Phraſeology: But if any one chooſes rather to ſay, *Logos of God*, it comes to the ſame Thing. The Sum is, that the Life and Soul, as it were, of the Euchariſtical *Remembrance*, lies in the due Conſideration of the *divine* Dignity of the Perſon whoſe Paſſion we there remember[f]. And indeed every Man's own Reaſon muſt convince him, that it muſt be ſo, if he ever ſeriouſly calls to mind the Scripture-Accounts of our bleſſed Lord, which I have above recited. Hitherto I have confined my ſelf to the ſtrict Notion of *Remembrance*.

II. I AM next to advance a Step farther to *Commemoration*, which is Remembrance and ſomewhat more. For, to a bare remembring it ſuperadds the Notion of *extolling*, *honouring*,

e Tu qui ad Chriſtum veniſti, (Pontificem verum qui ſanguine ſuo Deum tibi propitium fecit, & reconciliavit te patri) non hæreas in ſanguine carnis; ſed diſce potius *Sanguinem Verbi*, & audi ipſum tibi dicentem, quia *hic Sanguis meus eſt*, qui pro vobis effundetur in remiſſionem Peccatorum. Novit qui myſteriis imbutus eſt, & Carnem & Sanguinem *Verbi Dei*. *Origen* in Levit. Hom. IX. p. 243. 244. Ed. Bened. Conf. *Clem. Alex.* Pædagog. L. 2. c. 2. p. 186. τὸν λόγον ἐκχεόμενον &c.

f Great uſe was afterwards made of this Conſideration in the *Neſtorian* Controverſy: Of which ſee *Cyrill. Alex.* Ep. ad *Neſtor.* p. 72. & Anathem. XI. cum explanat. p. 156. item Apologet. adverſ. Oriental. p. 192. 193.

CHAP. III.

celebrating, and ſo it is collecting all into one *complex* Idea of *commemorating*. This do, *in Commemoration of me:* Which is the *ſecond* rendring of the ſame Words. Some perhaps might wonder why the *Socinians*, of all Men, ſhould reject the Notion of *remembring*, and chooſe that of *Commemoration* (which is really *higher*) yea and ſhould ſtrongly inſiſt upon it, and make it a Point. They certainly do ſo, as may appear from their own Writings[g]: And what is ſtranger ſtill, they aſſign ſuch odd Reaſons for it, that one would ſcarce think them in earneſt, if we were to look no farther. For, what if St. *Paul* does ſpeak of *declaring*, or *ſhewing* our Lord's *Death*, may not ἀνάμνησις ſtill ſignify *Remembrance?* Is it not proper firſt to *remember*, and then to *declare*; or to *declare*

g Apparet, *graviter erraſſe* illos qui exiſtimarunt verbum *Commemorationem*, quod in Græco eſt ἀνάμνησιν, mutari debere in *Recordationem:* Neque enim dicit Paulus mortem Domini *recordamini*, ſed mortem Domini *annuntiatis*, quod profecto non *Recordationem*, ſed *Commemorationem* & *Prædicationem* omnino ſignificat——————non eſt quod quis ex verbo illo (ἀνάμνησις) colligat Cœnam Domini in *eum finem* inſtitutam fuiſſe, ut nobis ſuggerat & in *memoriam revocet* mortem ipſius Domini——*Commemoratio* autem iſta, & *prædicatio* mortis Chriſti, id neceſſario conjunctum habet, ut gratiæ agantur Chriſto, tum vero *Deo, patri ejus*, cujus mandato animam ſuam poſuit. *Socin.* de uſu & fin. Cœnæ Domini, p. 4, 5.

Quod nonnulli per *Commemorationem* in verbis Chriſti quibus ritum hunc inſtituit, *Recordationem* intelligunt, vel hanc pro illa vocem reponunt, arbitrantes in *eum finem* ritum hunc ſacrum eſſe inſtitutum, ut nobis mortem Domini *in memoriam revocet*, in eo *manifeſte errant*; cum qui ritum hunc ſacrum obire recte velit, ac mortem Domini hac ratione *annuntiare*, eum Chriſti mortis probe & ſemper *memorem* eſſe oporteat. *Cracov. Catechiſm.* Sect. VI. c. 4. p. 229. conf. *Slichting.* in 1 *Cor.* XI. 25. & contr. *Meiſner.* p. 805, 814, 816. *Wolzogen.* in *Matth.* XXVI. p. 416.

it now, in order to *remember* for the future? Why ſhould one *exclude* the other, when both are conſiſtent, and ſuit well together? And tho' a Perſon is ſuppoſed, before his coming to the Holy Communion, to have the Lord's Death in Mind, confuſely, or in the *general*, may he not ſtill want to have it *more* in Mind, and to remember it in *particular*, with all its Circumſtances, upon a cloſe Recollection, aſſiſted by an *external* Solemnity performed before his Eyes? Beſides, if we ſhould not want to *call it to Mind*, yet we may want *to keep it in Mind* for the future: And who ſees not, how ſerviceable the Sacramental Solemnity may be for that very Purpoſe? Add to this, that it is particularly ſaid with reſpect to the Paſſover, *Thou ſhalt Sacrifice the Paſſover* &c. *that thou mayeſt remember the Day when thou cameſt out of Egypt, all the Days of thy Life*[h]. Which is exactly parallel, ſo far, to the *Remembrance* appointed in the Euchariſt. How trifling would it be to urge, that the *Iſraelites* were ſuppoſed to *remember* the *Day*, before their coming to the Paſſover, and therefore could have no Need to refreſh their *Memories* by coming; or to urge, that becauſe they *ought* always to *bear it in Mind*, therefore it could not be one *End*, or *Uſe* of the Paſſover, to *remind* them of it, or to keep it in *Remembrance* all their Days.

CHAP. III.

ONE may judge from hence, that *Socinus*'s pretended Reaſons againſt the Notion of *Remembrance* were mere Shuffle and Pretence,

h *Deuter.* XVI. 2, 3.

CHAP. III.

carrying more of *Art* and *Colouring* in them, than of *Truth*, or *Sincerity:* He had a Turn to ſerve in Favour of an *Hypotheſis*, and that was all. The Turn was this: He had a Mind to make the ἀνάμνησις, (which is one *End*, or *Uſe*, or *Part* of the Sacrament) to be the *Whole* of the Sacrament, its whole *Nature* and *Eſſence*, as I before hinted, and to interpret the Words, *This is my Body* and *This my Blood*, to mean, this *Bread* and *Wine*, or rather this *Action*, is an ἀνάμνησις, a *Commemoration*, and nothing more. He could not pretend to ſay, that this *material* Thing, or this *external* Action is a *Remembrance* (which denotes an *internal* Perception) and therefore He ſubſtitutes *Commemoration* in its Stead, an *outward* Act, an *external* Service, and then reſolves the *whole* of the Sacrament into That, confounding the *End*, or *Uſe* of the Thing with the *Thing* itſelf. This was his Fetch; and ſo He hoped to be rid at once, of all ſuppoſed preſent *Graces* or *Benefits* accruing to *worthy* Receivers, making the *Sign* and *Thing ſignified* to be all one, and indeed to be *Sign* only.

HOWEVER, tho' *Socinus* had no good Views in interpreting ἀνάμνησις by *Commemoration*, and was undoubtedly wrong in excluding *Remembrance*; yet ſetting aſide his foreign Fancies, it is very right to interpret the Word by *Commemoration*; but ſo as to *include* both an inward *Remembrance* of Benefits, and an outward *Celebration* of the ſame, together with *devout* Praiſes and Thankſgivings to Chriſt our Lord for them, and to all the three Perſons of the ever bleſſed Trinity.

Trinity. It is ſcarce poſſible for a conſiderate devout Mind to ſtop ſhort in a bare *Remembrance* (tho' Remembrance is always ſuppoſed, and is by this ſacred Solemnity reinforced) but it will of Courſe break out into thankful Praiſes and Adorations. We accept therefore of what *Socinus* and his Brethren ſo much contend for, that the Greek ἀνάμνησις, in this Caſe, does amount to a *Commemoration*, and is better rendred by that Word, than by *Remembrance*; becauſe the *Word* will bear it, and becauſe the Circumſtances ſhew that *Remembrance* alone, without *Commemoration* ſuperadded, is ſhort of the *Idea* intended by it. CHAP. III.

I MAY further note, though it is but the natural and obvious Conſequence of what I have before ſaid, that this Commemoration muſt be underſtood in as *high* and as *full* a Senſe, as the *Remembrance* ſpoken of above: We muſt commemorate our Lord in a Manner ſuitable to his *divine* Nature and Dignity, and according to *what He is* by the Scripture-Accounts. We muſt commemorate Him as *God*, purchaſing the Church with his *own Blood*[i]. We muſt commemorate his *Paſſion* as St. *Paul* has done. and in like Words with theſe: *Who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God: But made Himſelf of no Reputation, and took upon Him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the likeneſs of Men, and being found*

i *Acts* XX. 28. For the Reading of the Text, ſee *Mill.* in Loc. & *Pearſon* on the Creed. p. 129. & *Vitringa* Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. I. 213. & *Pfaffius* de var. Lect. p. 161.

CHAP. III.

in Faſhion as a Man, He humbled Himſelf and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Croſs [k]. In another Place, the ſame Apoſtle, ſpeaking of the *Redemption by the Blood* of Chriſt, and of his making *Peace thro' the Blood of the Croſs*, cloſes one, and uſhers in the other, with a large Account of the ſupereminent *Dignity* of his *Perſon*, as *born before the Creation*; adding, that *all Things were created by Him, and for Him, and by Him conſiſt* [l]. This is the right Way of celebrating, or commemorating his *Paſſion*, as it is declaring the infinite *Value* of it. To ſpeak of Him only as *Man*, or as a *Creature*, though otherwiſe in a devout way, is not *honouring*, but *diſhonouring* Him and his Sufferings; is not *commemorating*, but *blaſpheming* his Name. St. *Paul*, in another Place, going to ſpeak of our Lord's *Paſſion*, introduces it with a previous Deſcription of his *perſonal* Dignity: *Appointed Heir of all Things, by whom alſo He made the Worlds: Who being the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon, and upholding all Things by the Word of his Power, when He had by Himſelf purged our Sins, ſat down on the right Hand of the Majeſty on High* [m]. But as remarkable a Paſſage as any, is that of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*, where the Apoſtle, to inhance the *Value* of Chriſt's Sufferings, expreſſes himſelf thus: *If the Blood of Bulls, and of Goats, and the Aſhes of an Heifer ſprinkling the unclean,*

k *Phil.* II. 5, 6, 7, 8. See my Vth *Sermon.* And *Second Defence*, p. 227. and *Third*, p. 77.

l *Coloſſ.* I. 14.—20. Compare my *Sermons*, p. 58. &c. 153.

m *Hebr.* I. 2, 3.

ſanctifieth

ſanctifieth to the purifying of the Fleſh; How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt, who thro' the Eternal Spirit offered Himſelf without Spot to God, purge your Conſciences from dead Works to ſerve the living God[n]? By *eternal Spirit*, I underſtand Chriſt's *divine Nature*, as the moſt judicious Interpreters do[o]: And ſo from hence it is plain how the *Merit* of Chriſt's Sufferings riſes in Proportion to the Dignity of the Perſon, and it is the *Divinity* that ſtamps the *Value* upon the ſuffering *Humanity*. And hence alſo it is, that St. *John* ſo emphatically obſerves, that it is the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt *his Son* (that Son, whom the Apoſtle every where deſcribes under the moſt lofty Characters, as particularly *John* I.) which *cleanſeth us from all Sin*[p]. Such is the Scripture Way of *commemorating* our Lord and his Paſſion, and ſuch the Way of all the ancient Churches of God: Be this our Pattern, as it ought to be, for our *Commemorations* in the Holy Communion. CHAP. III.

III. BUT I obſerved, that there was a *Third*, or a *Fourth* rendring of the ſame Words, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. *For a Memorial of me:* or, *for my Memorial*, which is more ſtrictly literal. This rendring is not much different from the two former, but contains and includes Both: For, a *Memorial* ſuppoſes and takes in both a *Remembrance*, and a *Commemoration*. Whether it ſuperadds any Thing to them, and makes

n *Hebr.* IX. 13, 14.
o See *Bull.* opp. p. 19. And *Wolfius* in loc.
p 1 *John* I. 7.

the

CHAP. III.

the *Idea* ſtill *larger*, or *fuller*, is the Queſtion. If it carries in it any tacit Alluſion to the *Sacrificial* Memorials of the old Teſtament, it may then be conceiv'd to add to the Idea of *Commemoration* the Idea of *acceptable*, and *well-pleaſing*, viz. to Almighty God. I build not upon Ἀνάμνησις being twice uſed in the *Septuagint* as the Name for a *Sacrificial* Memorial [q]; for the *uſual* Senſe of the Word, in the ſame Septuagint, is different, having no Relation to *Sacrifice*: But thus far may be juſtly pleaded, from the Nature and Reaſon of the Thing, that the *Service* of the Euchariſt, (the moſt proper Part of *Evangelical Worſhip*, and moſt *ſolemn* Religious Act of the Chriſtian Church) muſt be underſtood to aſcend up *for a Memorial before God*, in as ſtrict a Senſe, at leaſt, as *Cornelius*'s Alms and Prayers were ſaid ſo to do [r]; or as the *Prayers of the Saints* go up as ſweet Odours, myſtical *Incenſe* [f], before God. Indeed, the *Incenſe* and Sacrificial Memorials of the old Teſtament were moſtly *typical* of Evangelical *Worſhip* or *Chriſtian Services*, and were *acceptable* to God under that View; and therefore it cannot be doubted but the true rational *Incenſe*, viz. Goſpel-Services, rightly performed, (and among theſe more eſpecially the *Euchariſtical Service*) are the acceptable *Memorials* in God's Sight. Whether there was any ſuch *Alluſion*

q *Levit.* XXIV. 7. *Numb.* X. 21.

r *Acts* X. 4.

f *Revel.* V. 8. VIII. 3, 4. *Pſalm* CXLI. 2. Compare *Malach.* I. 11. Vid. *Vitringa*, in Apocalypſ. p. 214, &c. 333, &c. *Dodwell.* incenſing no Apoſtolical Tradition, p. 36, 37, 38.

intended

intended in the Name Ἀνάμνησις, when our Lord recommended the Obſervance of the Euchariſt as *his Memorial*, cannot be *certainly* determined, ſince the Name *might* carry in it ſuch an Alluſion, or might be *without it*: But as to the *Thing*, that ſuch *Worſhip* rightly perform'd has the *Force*, and *Value* of any *Memorial* elſewhere mentioned in Scripture (*Sacrificial*, or other) cannot be doubted; and the reſt is not worth diſputing, or would make too large a Digreſſion in this Place. CHAP. III.

BEFORE I diſmiſs the Word Ἀνάμνησις, it may not be improper to note, that it occurs but once more in the New Teſtament, where St. *Paul* ſpeaks of the *Commemoration of Sins*[t], made once a Year, under the Old Teſtament, on the great Day of Expiation; when the High Prieſt was to *confeſs all the Iniquities of the Children of Iſrael, and all their Tranſgreſſions in all their Sins*[u]. There was ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν, *Commemoration of Sins*: But under the Goſpel, it is happily changed into ἀνάμνησις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *Commemoration of Chriſt*. There *Sins* were remembred; here *Forgiveneſs* of Sins: A remarkable Privilege of the Goſpel-Oeconomy, above the *Legal*. Not but that there was *Forgiveneſs* alſo under the Old Teſtament, *legal* and *external* Forgiveneſs *by the Law*, and *myſtical* Forgiveneſs *under the Law*, by Vertue of the Sacrifice of Chriſt fore-ordained, and fore-ſhadowed: But under the Goſpel, Forgiveneſs is clearly,

t Ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. *Hebr.* X. 3.
u Vid. *Levit.* XVI. 21.

and

CHAP. III. and without a Figure declared, and for *all Sins* repented of; and there is *no Remembrance* of them more[w]; no *Commemoration* of them by *legal* Sacrifices, but inſtead thereof a continual *Commemoration* of Chriſt's Sacrifice for the *Remiſſion of Sins*, in the Chriſtian Sacraments. There muſt indeed be *Confeſſion* of Sins, and *forſaking* them alſo under the Goſpel-Diſpenſation: But then it is without the Burden of *ritual* Expiations, and *ceremonial* Atonements: For, the *many* and *grievous* Sacrifices are all converted into one eaſy (and to every good Man delightful) *Commemoration* of the all-ſufficient Sacrifice, in the Holy Communion. But I return.

HITHERTO I have been conſidering the Euchariſtical Commemoration as a Memorial *before God*, which is the higheſt View of it: But I muſt not omit to take Notice, that it is a Memorial alſo *before Men*, in the ſame Senſe as the *Paſchal* Service was. Of the Paſſover it is ſaid: *This Day ſhall be unto you for a Memorial, and you ſhall keep it a Feaſt to the Lord*[x]. It is here called a *Feaſt* to the Lord, and a *Memorial* to the People: Not but that it was a *Memorial* alſo to *the Lord*, in the large Senſe of Memorial before mentioned (as every *pious* and *grateful* Acknowledgment to *God* for Mercies received, is). But in the *ſtricter* Senſe of *Memorial*, it was ſuch only to the People. It is farther ſaid in the ſame Chapter, of the Paſchal Service: *Ye ſhall obſerve this Thing for an*

w *Jerem.* XXXI. 34. x *Exod.* XII. 14.

Ordinance

Ordinance to Thee and to thy Sons for ever — And when your Children ſhall ſay unto you, What mean you by this Service? Ye ſhall ſay, It is the Sacrifice of the Lord's Paſſover, who paſſed over the Houſes of the Children of Iſrael in Egypt, when he ſmote the Egyptians and delivered our Houſes[y]. And in the next Chapter[z]: *It ſhall be for a Sign unto Thee upon thine Hand, and for a Memorial between thine Eyes, that the Lord's Law may be in thy Mouth*, &c. In ſuch a Senſe as this, the Service of the Euchariſt is a *Memorial* left to the Church of Chriſt, to perpetuate the *Memory* of that *great Deliverance* from the Bondage of Sin and Satan (of which the former Deliverance from *Egyptian* Bondage was but a *Type)* to all ſucceeding Generations. By this ſolemn Service, beſides other Uſes, God has admirably provided for the Bulk of Mankind, that they may be conſtantly and viſibly *reminded* of what it ſo much concerns them both to know and attend to. It is to the illiterate inſtead of Books, and anſwers the Purpoſe better than a Thouſand Monitors without it might do. Jeſus Chriſt is hereby *ſet forth crucified*[a], as it were, *before their Eyes*, in order to make the ſtronger Impreſſion. CHAP. III.

I MAY further obſerve, that as all the *Paſſovers*, after the *firſt*, were a kind of Repreſentations and Commemorations of that *Original*[b],

y *Exod.* XII. 24, 26, 27.
z *Exod.* XIII. 9. Compare *Deut.* XVI. 3.
a *Galat.* III. 1.
b See *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part II. p. 44.

ſo

CHAP. III.

ſo all our *Euchariſtical* Paſſovers are a Sort of Commemorations of the *Original* Euchariſt. Which I the rather take Notice of, becauſe I find an ancient *Father*, (if we may depend upon a *Fragment) Hippolytus*, who was a Diſciple of *Irenæus*, repreſenting the Thing in that View: For commenting on *Prov.* IX. 2. *Wiſdom hath furniſhed her Table*, He writes thus: "Namely, the promiſed Knowledge of the Holy "Trinity; and alſo, his precious and undefiled *Body* and *Blood*, which are daily adminiſtred at the myſtical and ſacred *Table*, ſacrificed for a *Memorial* of that *ever memorable*, "and *Original* Table of the myſtical Divine "Supper [c]. Upon which Words, I may remark, by the Way, that here is Mention made of the *Body* and *Blood* as *ſacrificed* in the Euchariſt, 20 or 30 Years before *Cyprian*, if the *Fragment* be certainly *Hippolytus*'s, and then it is the *earlieſt* in its Kind, though not higher than the *Third* Century. As to his making all ſucceeding Euchariſts *Memorials* of the *Firſt*, the Notion interferes not with their being Memorials alſo of our *Lord* and his *Paſſion*, as before explained, but all the ſeveral Views will hang well together.

THUS far I have been conſidering the Chriſtian Euchariſt as a *Remembrance*, and a *Com-*

c Καὶ ἡτοιμάσατο τὴν ἑαυτῆς τράπεζαν· τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος καλεπαγγελλομένω. Καὶ τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μυστικῇ καὶ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιτελοῦνται, θυόμενα εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀειμνήστου καὶ πρώτης ἐκείνης τοῦ μυστικοῦ θείου δείπνου. Hippolyt. Vol. I. p. 282. Ed. Fabric.

memoration, and a *Memorial* of Chriſt our Lord. I could not avoid intermixing ſomething, here and there, of our Lord's *Death* and *Paſſion*, which have ſo cloſe an Affinity with the Subject of this Chapter: Nevertheleſs that Article may require a more *diſtinct* Conſideration, and therefore it may be proper to have a *ſeparate* Chapter for it. CHAP. IV.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Commemoration of the Death of our Lord made in the Holy Communion.

IT is not ſufficient to commemorate the *Death* of Chriſt, without conſidering what his Death *means*, what were the *moving* Reaſons for it, and what its *Ends*, and *Uſes*. The Subtilties of *Socinus* and his Followers have made this Enquiry neceſſary: For it is to very little Purpoſe *to ſhew the Lord's Death till He come*, by the Service of the Euchariſt, if we acknowledge not *That Lord* which the Scriptures ſet forth, nor *That Death* which the New Teſtament teaches. As to *Lord*, who and what He is, I have ſaid what I conceived ſufficient, in the preceding Chapter: And now I am to ſay ſomething of that *Death* which He ſuffered, as a willing *Sacrifice* to divine *Juſtice* for the *Sins* of Mankind. It is impoſſible that a Man ſhould come *worthily* to the Holy Communion, while He perverts the prime *Ends* and *Uſes* of the *Sacrifice* there commemorated, and ſets up a *Righteouſneſs*

CHAP. IV.

Righteouſneſs of his *own*, independent of it, fruſtrating the *Grace* of God in Chriſt, and making Him to have *died in vain* [d].

THE *Death* of Chriſt, by the Scripture Account, was properly a vicarious *Puniſhment* of Sin, a true and proper *Expiatory Sacrifice* for the *Sins* of Mankind: And therefore it ought to be *remembred* as ſuch, in the *Memorial* we make of it, at the Lord's Table. I ſhall cite ſome Texts, juſt to give the Reader a competent Notion of the Scripture Doctrine in this Article; though indeed the Thing is ſo plain, and ſo frequently inculcated, from one End of the Scriptures to the other, that no Man (one would think) who is not previouſly diſpoſed to deceive Himſelf, or has imbibed ſtrong Prejudices, could either reject it, or miſconceive it.

1. THAT the Sufferings of Chriſt had the Nature of *Puniſhments*, rather than of mere *Calamities*, is proved from what is ſaid by the Prophet *Iſaiah*, as follows: *He hath born our Griefs, and carried our Sorrows——He was wounded for our Tranſgreſſions, He was bruiſed for our Iniquities: The Chaſtiſement of our Peace was upon Him, and with his Stripes we are healed.——The Lord hath laid on Him the Iniquity of us all.——*

d Quidam vero, quomodo aliquando *Judæi*, & *Chriſtianos* ſe dici volunt, & adhuc ignorantes *Dei* juſtitiam, *ſuam* volunt conſtituere, etiam temporibus noſtris, temporibus apertæ gratiæ, &c. ——— Quod ait Apoſtolus de *Lege*, hoc nos iſtis dicimus de *Natura*; Si per *Naturam* juſtitia, ergo Chriſtus *gratis* mortuus eſt. *Auguſtin* Serm. 13. in Johan. VI. opp. Tom. V. p. 645, 646. Edit. Bened.

For

For the Tranſgreſſion of my People was He ſtricken —When Thou ſhalt make his Soul an Offering for Sin, &c. *He was numbred with the Tranſgreſſors, and bare the Sin of many* [e]. What can all theſe Words mean, if they amount not to *Puniſhment* for the Sins of Mankind? Evaſions have been invented, and they have been often refuted. CHAP. IV.

To the ſame Purpoſe, we read in the New Teſtament, that *He was delivered for our Offences* [f], that He *died for all*, was *made Sin for us*, when He *knew no Sin* [g]; *was made a Curſe for us* [h], *died for our Sins* [i], *gave Himſelf for our Sins* [k], *taſted Death for every Man* [l], and the like. To interpret theſe and other ſuch Texts of dying for our *Advantage*, without Relation to *Sin* and the *Penalty* due to it, is altogether forced, and unnatural, contrary to the Cuſtom of Language, and to the obvious Import of very plain Words.

2. THAT our Bleſſed Lord was in his Death a proper *expiatory* Sacrifice (if ever there was any) is as plain from the New Teſtament as Words can make it. He gave *his Life a Ranſom for many* [m], *was the Lamb of God*, which was to *take away the Sins of the World* [n], *died for the Ungodly* [o], *gave Himſelf a Ranſom for all* [p], once

e *Iſa.* LIII. 4. —— 12. conf. *Outram.* de Sacrific. p. 319. &c. —— 328. 1 *Pet.* II. 24. & *Outram.* p. 329, &c.
f *Rom.* IV. 25.
g 2 *Cor.* V. 14, 15, 21. *John* XI. 51, 52.
h *Gal.* III. 13. i 1 *Cor.* XV. 3.
k *Gal.* I. 4 l *Hebr.* II. 9.
m *Matt.* XX. 28. n *John* I. 29.
o *Rom.* V. 6. p 1 *Tim.* II. 6, 8.

CHAP. IV. *ſuffered for Sins, the juſt for the unjuſt*[q], *gave Himſelf for us, an Offering and a Sacrifice to God for a ſweet ſmelling Savour*[r]. *Chriſt our Paſſover was ſacrificed for us*[s], *offered up himſelf*[t], *to bear the Sins of many*[u], has *put away Sin by the Sacrifice of Himſelf*[w]. We have been *redeemed with the precious Blood of Chriſt, as of a Lamb without Blemiſh and without Spot*[x]. Theſe are not mere *Alluſions* to the Sacrifices of the Old Teſtament, but they are interpretative of them, declaring their *Typical* Nature, as prefiguring the *grand Sacrifice*, and centring in it: Which, beſides other Conſiderations, appears very evidently from the whole Deſign and Tenour of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; ſignifying, that the legal Sacrifices were *Alluſions* to, and *Prefigurations* of the *grand* Sacrifice.

3. THAT from this Sacrifice, and by virtue of it, we receive the Benefit of *Atonement, Redemption, Propitiation, Juſtification, Reconciliation, Remiſſion*, &c. is no leſs evident from abundance of Places in the New Teſtament. *Thro' our Lord Jeſus Chriſt we have received the Atonement*, and *we are reconciled to God by his Death*[y]. *Him God hath ſet forth to be a Propitiation thro' Faith in his Blood*[z]. *He is the Propitiation for our Sins,—for the Sins of the whole*

q 1 *Pet.* III. 18. Compare II. 21. IV. 1.
r *Epheſ* V. 2. s 1 *Cor.* V. 7.
t *Hebr.* VII. 27. X. 12. IX. 14.
u *Hebr.* IX. 28. w *Hebr.* IX. 26. Compare X. 12.
x 1 *Pet.* I. 19. y *Rom.* V. 10, 11.
z *Rom.* III. 25.

World

World[a]. *We are juſtified by his Blood*[b], *redeemed to God by his Blood*[c], *cleanſed from all Sin by his Blood*[d], *waſhed from our Sins in his Blood*[e]: And the *Robes* of the *Saints* are *waſhed* and *made white* only in the *Blood* of the Lamb[f]. By Himſelf He *purged our Sins*[g], *viz.* when He ſhed his Blood upon the Croſs: And our *Redemption* is through his *Blood*[h]. He hath *reconciled* us to *God*, by the *Croſs*[i], *in the Body of his Fleſh thro' Death*[k]. *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto Himſelf, not imputing their Treſpaſſes unto them*[l]. His *Blood* was *ſhed for many, for the Remiſſion of Sins*[m], *and without ſhedding of Blood is no Remiſſion*[n]. It is this *Blood of Sprinkling*, that *ſpeaketh better Things than the Blood of Abel*[o]: And it is by the *Blood of Jeſus*, that Men muſt *enter* into *the Holieſt*[p], as many as enter. I have thrown theſe Texts together without Note, or Comment; for they need none, they interpret themſelves. Let but the Reader obſerve, with what Variety of Expreſſion this great Truth is inculcated, that our Salvation chiefly ſtands in the *meritorious* Sufferings of our Saviour Chriſt. The Conſideration whereof made St. *Paul* ſay, *I determined not to know any Thing among you, ſave Jeſus Chriſt, and Him crucified*[q]: Namely, becauſe this was a moſt *eſſential* Ar-

a 1 *John* II. 2. IV. 10.
b *Rom.* V. 9. c *Revel.* V. 9. d 1 *John* I. 7.
e *Revel.* I. 5. f *Revel.* VII. 14. g *Hebr.* I. 3.
h *Epheſ.* I. 7. Compare 1 *Cor.* VI. 20. *Coloſſ.* I. 14.
i *Epheſ.* II. 16. k *Coloſſ.* I. 22. l 2 *Cor.* V. 18, 19.
m *Matt.* XXVI. 28. n *Hebr.* IX. 22. o *Hebr.* XII. 24.
p *Hebr.* X. 19. q 1 *Cor.* II. 2.

CHAP. IV.

ticle, the very Sum and Subſtance of the Goſpel. "In theſe and in a great many more "Paſſages that lie ſpread in all the Parts of "the New Teſtament, it is as plain as Words "can make any Thing, that the *Death* of "Chriſt is propoſed to us as a *Sacrifice* and "*Reconciliation*, our *Atonement* and *Redemption*. "So it is not poſſible for any Man that conſiders all this, to imagine, that Chriſt's Death "was only a *Confirmation* of his Goſpel, a *Pattern* of a holy and patient ſuffering of Death, "and a neceſſary *Preparation* to his Reſurrection. —— By this, all the *high Commendations* of his Death, amount only to this, that "He by *dying* has given a vaſt Credit and Authority to his Goſpel, which was the powerfulleſt Mean poſſible to redeem us from "Sin, and to reconcile us to God. But this "is ſo contrary to the *whole Deſign* of the New "Teſtament, and to the *true* Importance of "that great *Variety of Phraſes*, in which this "Matter is ſet out, that at this Rate of expounding Scripture, we can never know what "we may build upon; eſpecially, when the "*great Importance* of this Thing, and of our "having right Notions concerning it, is well "conſidered [r].

THE leaſt that we can infer from the *Texts* above mentioned is, that there is ſome very particular *Virtue*, *Merit*, *Efficacy* in the *Death* of Chriſt, that God's *Acceptance* of Sinners, tho' *penitent* (not *perfect*) depended entirely upon it.

r Bp. *Burnet* on Article the 2*d*. p. 54.

Common Sacrifices could never *make the Comers thereunto perfect* [f]: But it was abſolutely *neceſſary*, that the *Heavenly Things* ſhould be *purified* with ſome *better Sacrifice* [t]. Which is ſo true, that our Lord is repreſented as *entring* into the Holy of Holies (that is Heaven) *by his own Blood* [u], where *He ever liveth to make Interceſſion for* Thoſe that *come unto God by Him* [w]. The *Efficacy* even of his Interceſſion above (great and powerful as He is) yet depends chiefly upon that Circumſtance, his having entred thither by *his own Blood*; that is to ſay, upon the *Merit* of his Death and Paſſion, and the *Atonement* thereby made. His *Interceſſion* belongs to his *Prieſtly* Office, and That ſuppoſes the *Offering* before made: For there was a *Neceſſity* that He ſhould *have ſomewhat to offer* [x], and nothing leſs than *Himſelf* [y]. Seeing therefore that, in order to our *Redemption*, Chriſt ſuffered as a *piacular* Victim (which muſt be underſtood to be *in our Stead)* and that there was ſome *Neceſſity* He ſhould do ſo, and that his prevailing *Interceſſion* at God's right Hand now, and to the End of the World, ſtands upon that Ground, and muſt do ſo; what can we think leſs but that ſome very momentous Reaſons CHAP. IV.

f *Hebr.* X. 1. t *Hebr.* IX. 23.

u *Hebr.* IX. 12. Note, it is not only ſaid, that Chriſt entred into Heaven by his *own* Blood, but he is there alſo conſidered as the *Lamb ſlain:* Revel. V. 6. Which farther ſhews wherein principally the *Virtue* of his *Interceſſion* conſiſts.

w *Hebr.* VII. 25. Conf. *Rom.* VIII. 33, 34. *Hebr.* II. 17. IX. 24. 1 *John* II. 2.

x *Hebr.* VIII. 3. V. 1.

y *Hebr.* IX. 14, 25, 26, 28. Compare I. 3.

CHAP. IV.

of *Juſtice*, or of *Government* (both which reſolve at length into one) required that ſo it ſhould be. We are not indeed competent Judges of all the Reaſons or Meaſures of an all-wiſe God, with Reſpect to his Dealings with his Creatures; neither are we able to argue as it were *beforehand*, with ſufficient Certainty, about the *Terms* of Acceptance, which his *Wiſdom*, or his *Holineſs*, or his *Juſtice* might demand. But we ought to take careful Heed to what He has *ſaid*, and what He has *done*, and to draw the proper Concluſions from Both. One Thing is plain, from the Terms of the *firſt Covenant*, made in Paradiſe, that divine Wiſdom could have admitted Man *perfectly innocent* to perfect Happineſs, without the Intervention of any *Sacrifice*, or any *Mediator*: And it is no leſs plain, from the Terms of the *new Covenant*, that there was ſome *Neceſſity* (fixed in the very Reaſon and Nature of Things) that a *valuable* Conſideration, Atonement, or *Sacrifice* ſhould be offered, to make *fallen Man* capable of eternal Glory [z]. The Truth of the Thing *done* proves its *Neceſſity* (beſides what I have alledged from *expreſs* Scripture, concerning ſuch *Neceſſity*) for it is not imaginable that ſo great a Thing would have been done upon

z Si non fuiſſet peccatum, non neceſſe fuerat filium Dei Agnum fieri, nec opus fuerat eum in carne poſitum jugulari ſed manſiſſet hoc quod in principio erat, *Deus verbum*: verum quoniam intravit peccatum in hunc mundum, peccati autem neceſſitas *propitiationem* requirit, & propitiatio non fit niſi per *Hoſtiam*, neceſſarium fuit provideri Hoſtiam pro peccato. *Origen.* in Num. Hom. 24. p. 362.

Earth,

Earth, and afterwards as it were, conſtantly *commemorated* in Heaven[a], if there had not been very ſtrong and preſſing *Reaſons* for it, and ſuch as made it as *neceſſary*, (in the *divine* Counſels) as it was neceſſary for a God of infinite Perfection, to be *wiſe* and *holy*, *juſt* and *good*. When I ſaid, *conſtantly commemorated in Heaven*, I had an Eye to Chriſt's *continual Interceſſion*[b], which is a kind of *Commemoration* of the Sacrifice which he once offered upon the Croſs, and is always *pleading* the *Merit* of. Which ſhews ſtill, of what exceeding great Moment That *Sacrifice* was, for the reconciling the *Acceptance* of *ſinful* Men, with the *Ends* of *divine Government*, the Manifeſtation of *divine Glory*, and the unalterable Perfection of the *divine Attributes*. And if That *Sacrifice* is repreſented and pleaded in *Heaven* by Chriſt Himſelf, for Remiſſion of Sins, That ſhews that there is an *intrinſick* Virtue, Value, Merit in it, for the Purpoſes intended: And it ſhews farther, how rational, and how proper our *Euchariſtical* Service is, as *commemorating* the ſame *Sacrifice* here below, which our Lord Himſelf *commemorates* above. God may reaſonably require of us this *humble* Acknowledgment, this

CHAP. IV.

a Eſt ergo duplex, ut *Legalium* quarundam Victimarum, ita *Chriſti* oblatio, prior *mactationis*, altera *oſtentionis* Legalium Victimarum; *prior* peracta in *Templo*, altera in ipſo *penetrali*: Chriſti *prior* in *terris*, poſterior in *Cælo*. Prior tamen illa non ſacrificii præparatio, ſed ſacrificium: Poſterior non tam ſacrificium, quam *ſacrificii facti commemoratio*. *Grot.* de Satisfact. in fine.

b Chriſt is not entred into the Holy Places made with Hands (which are the Figures of the true) but into *Heaven* itſelf, now to *appear* in the *Preſence of God for us*. Hebr. IX. 24.

CHAP. IV.

Self-Abaſement, that after we have done our beſt, we are *Offenders* ſtill, tho' *penitent* Offenders, and have not done all that we ought to have done; and that therefore we can claim nothing in virtue of our *own Righteouſneſs* conſidered by itſelf, ſeparate from the additional Virtue of that *all-ſufficient* Sacrifice, which alone can render even our *beſt* Services accepted [c].

IF it ſhould be objected, that we have a *Covenant-Claim* by the Goſpel, and that That Covenant was entirely owing to *divine Mercy*, and that ſo we reſolve not our Right and Title into any ſtrict Merits of our own, but into the *pure Mercy* of God, and that This ſuffices without any reſpect to a *Sacrifice:* I ſay, if this ſhould be pleaded, I anſwer, that no ſuch *Covenant-Claim* appears, ſeparate from all reſpect to a *Sacrifice*. The Covenant is, that Perſons ſo and ſo *qualified*, ſhall be acceptable *in* and *thro'* Chriſt, and by *virtue* of That very *Sacrifice* which He entred *with*, into the Holy of Holies, and by which He now *intercedes*, and *appears* for us. Beſides, it is not right to think, nor is it modeſt or pious to ſay, that in the Oeconomy of every Man's Salvation, the *Ground-Work only* is God's, by ſettling the Covenant, and the *finiſhing* Part ours by performing the Conditions; but the true Order or Method is for our Lord to be both the *Author* and *Finiſher* of the whole. The *Covenant*, or rather, the *Covenant-Charter* was given ſoon after the Fall

c See our XIth Article, with Bp. *Burnet*'s Notes upon it, and Mr. *Welchman*'s.

to

to Mankind in general, and has been carried on thro' ſucceſſive Generations, by new ſtipulating-Acts in every Age: So likewiſe was the *Atonement* made (or *conſider'd* as made) *once for all*, but is *applied* to Particulars, or Individuals, *continually*, by means of Chriſt's conſtant abiding *Interceſſion*. Therefore it is not barely our performing the *Conditions*, that *finiſhes* our Salvation, but it is our Lord's *applying* his Merits to our *Performances* that finiſhes all. Perhaps this whole Matter may be more clearly repreſented by a diſtinct Enumeration of the ſeveral concurring Means to the ſame End. 1. The Divine *Philanthropy* has the firſt Hand in our Salvation, is the *primary*, or *principal* Cauſe. 2. Our performing the Duties required, *Faith* and *Repentance*, by the Aid of Divine Grace, is the *conditional* Cauſe. 3. The *Sacrifice* of Chriſt's Death, recommending and rendring *acceptable* our imperfect Performances, is the *meritorious* Cauſe. 4. The Divine *Ordinances*, and more particularly, the two Sacraments (ſo far as diſtinct from *conditional)* are the *inſtrumental* [d] Cauſes, in and by which God *applies* to Men fitly diſpoſed, the *Virtue* of that Sacrifice. Let theſe Things be *ſuppoſed* only, at preſent, for clearer Conception: *Proofs* of every Thing will appear in due Time and Place. By this Account may be competently underſtood the End

CHAP. IV.

d I underſtand *Inſtrument* here in no other Senſe, but as Deeds of Conveyance, or *Forms* of Inveſtiture, ſuch as a *Ring*, a *Croſier*, *Letters Patent*, *Broad Seal*, and the like, are called *Inſtruments*: Which ſhall be explained hereafter.

and

CHAP. IV.

and Uſe of *commemorating* the Sacrifice of our Lord's Paſſion in the *Holy Communion.* It correſponds with the Commemoration made *above:* It is ſuing for Pardon, in virtue of the *ſame* Plea that Chriſt Himſelf ſues in, on our Behalf: It is acknowledging our indiſpenſable *Need* of it, and our *Dependance* upon it; and confeſſing all our other Righteouſneſs to be as *nothing* without it. In a Word, it is at once a Service of *Thankſgiving* (to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt) for the *Sacrifice* of our Redemption, and a Service alſo of *Self-Humiliation* before God, Angels, and Men.

IF it ſhould be objected here, that *ſhewing forth* our Lord's Death, cannot well be underſtood of *ſhewing* to God, who wants not to have any Thing *ſhewn* to Him, all Things being naked before Him; it is obvious to reply, that He permits and commands us, in innumerable Inſtances to *preſent* our ſelves, and our *Addreſſes* before Him: And tho' the very Word καταγγέλλειν, which St. *Paul* makes uſe of in this Caſe[e], is not elſewhere uſed for *ſhewing to God*, yet ἀναγγέλλειν, a Word of like Import, is[f]; ſo that there is no juſt Objection to be drawn merely from the Phraſeology. As to the Reaſon of the Thing, ſince *Addreſſes to God* have always gone along with the *Repreſentation* made in the Communion, and are part of the *Commemoration*, it muſt be underſtood that we

e 1 *Cor.* XI. 26. Τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε.

f Ἀναγγέλλω σήμερον κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου. κ. τ. λ. *Deut.* XXVI. 3. Conf. *Pſal.* XXXVIII. 18.

repreſent,

repreſent, what we do repreſent, *to God*, as well as to Men. CHAP. IV.

HAVING thus diſpatch'd what I intended concerning the *Remembrance*, *Commemoration*, or *Memorial* of our Lord, and of his Paſſion, made in this Sacrament, I might now proceed to a new Chapter. But there is an incidental Point, or two, to be diſcuſs'd, which ſeem to fall in our way, and which therefore I ſhall here briefly conſider, before I go farther.

1. IT has been ſuggeſted by ſome[g], that the Notion of *Remembrance*, or *Commemoration*, in this Service, is an Argument againſt *preſent* receiving of *Benefits* in, or by it: Chriſt and his Benefits are to be *remembred* or *commemorated* here; therefore neither *He*, nor his *Benefits* are ſuppoſed to be *actually* receiv'd at the Time. This is not the Place proper for examining the Queſtion about *preſent* or *actual* Benefits: But it may be proper, while we are ſtating the Notion of *Remembrance*, to obviate an Objection drawn from it, in order to clear our way ſo far. I ſee no force at all in the Argument, unleſs it could be proved that the Word *Remembrance* muſt always be referred to

g Jam conſtat Homines ibi non *participare*, vel *ſortiri*, vel *accipere* Sanguinem Chriſti: Participatio enim, vel Sortitio, *rei præſentis* eſt; at Benedictio, quæ hoc loco idem eſt quod *commemoratio*, rei *præteritæ* eſſe ſolet. *Smalc.* contr. Frantz. p. 331.

Notandum *Recordationem* rebus verè & realiter *præſentibus* nullo modo tribui poſſe: non enim dici poſſumus eorum recordari quibus tunc cum maxime præſentibus fruimur, cum *Recordatio* mere ad *præterita* pertineat. *Przipcovius* ad 1 Cor. XI. 20. p. 91.

ſomething

CHAP. IV.

ſomething *paſt*, or *abſent*: Which is a Suppoſition not warranted by the cuſtomary Uſe of Language. *Remember thy Creator*: Does it follow, that the Creator is not preſent? *Remember the Sabbath-Day* (when preſent I ſuppoſe) to keep it holy. Let *Remembrance* ſignify *calling to Mind*[h]; may we not call to Mind *preſent* Benefits, which are *inviſible*, and which eaſily ſlip out of our Thoughts, or perhaps rarely occur, being thruſt out by *ſenſible* Things? Or let it ſignify *keeping in Mind*; if ſo, there is no Impropriety in ſaying, that we keep in Mind what is *preſent* and *not ſeen*, by the Help of what *is ſeen*. Let it ſignify *commemorating*: May not a Man commemorate a *Benefaction*, ſuppoſe, which is in ſome Senſe *paſt*, but is *preſent* alſo in its *abiding* Fruits and Influences, which are the ſtrongeſt Motives for commemorating the ſame? Indeed, it would be hard to vindicate the Wiſdom of *commemorating* what is *paſt*, or *abſent*, were there not ſome *preſent* Benefits reſulting from it. I preſume, if a *Benefaction* were wholly loſt, or ſunk, the uſual *Commemoration* of it would ſoon ſink with it: The *preſent* Benefits are what keep it up. We do not ſay that Chriſt's *Death*, or Chriſt's *Cru-*

h ABp. *Tillotſon*, explaining the Scripture Notion of *Remembrance*, ſays: *Remembrance* is the *actual* Thought of what we "do *habitually* know. — To *remember* a Perſon, or Thing, is "to call them to Mind upon all proper and fitting Occaſions, to "think *actually* of them, ſo as to do that which the *Remem*-"*brance* of them does require, or prompt us to. *Serm.* 54. p. 638 Fol. Edit.

I ſee not why *preſent* Benefits may not thus be *remembred*, and deſerve to be ſo, rather than *paſt*, or *abſent*, or *diſtant* Benefits.

cifixion

ciſixion is now *preſent*; we know it is *paſt*: But the *Benefits* remain, and while we remember one as *paſt*, we *call to Mind*, or *keep in Mind* the other alſo, as *preſent*, but *inviſible*, and therefore eaſily overlooked. I ſee no Impropriety in this Manner of ſpeaking: Nor if a Perſon ſhould be exhorted to *remember* that He has a *Soul* to be *ſaved*, that ſuch an Admonition would imply, that his Soul is *abſent* from his Body. CHAP. IV.

2. ANOTHER incidental Queſtion like the former, is whether from the Notion of *Remembrance* in this Sacrament, a concluſive Argument may be formed againſt the *corporal Preſence*, and particularly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation?* Notwithſtanding that we have many clear Demonſtrations againſt that ſtrange Doctrine, yet I ſhould be far from rejecting any *additional* Argument, provided it were ſolid and juſt: But I perceive not of what Uſe the Word *Remembrance* can be in this Caſe, or how any certain Argument can be drawn from it. The Words are *Remembrance of me:* Therefore, if any *Abſence* can be proved from thence, it muſt be the Abſence of what ME there ſtands for, that is, of the *whole Perſon* of Chriſt; and ſo it appears as concluſive againſt a *Spiritual* Preſence, as againſt a *corporal* one, and proves *too much* to prove any Thing. Surely, we may *remember* Chriſt, in ſtrict Propriety of Expreſſion, and yet believe Him to be *preſent* at the ſame Time; eſpecially conſidering that He is *always preſent with his Church, even to the End of the World,*

CHAP. IV.

World[i], and that *where two or three are gathered together in his Name, there* is He *in the Midſt of them*[k]; and He has often told us, of his *dwelling* in good Men. So then, ſince it is not ſaid Remembrance of *my Body*, but Remembrance *of Me*, and ſince it is certain, that one Part at leaſt of what ought to be *remembred*, is *preſent* (not abſent) therefore no Argument can be juſtly drawn merely from the Word *Remembrance*, as neceſſarily inferring the *Abſence* of the Thing remembred.

BUT if it had been ſaid *Remembrance* of my *Body*, or *Blood*, yet neither ſo would the Argument be concluſive, if we attend ſtrictly to the *Romiſh* Perſuaſion. For they do not aſſert any *viſible* Preſence of Chriſt's *Body*, or *Blood*, but they ſay, that his natural Body and Blood are *inviſibly*, or in a *Spiritual Manner*, preſent, under the *Accidents*, or *viſible* Appearances of Bread and Wine. Now what is *inviſible*, is ſo far imperceptible, unleſs by the *Eye of Faith*, and wants as much to be *called to Mind*, as any *abſent* Thing whatſoever. Therefore *Remembrance*, or calling to Mind might be very proper in this Caſe: For, what is out of *Sight*, may eaſily ſlip out of *Mind*.

IF any particular *reſtrained* Senſe of *Remembrance* ſhould be thought on, to help out the Argument; there will ſtill remain a great Difficulty, namely, to prove that Ἀνάμνησις in the Words of the Inſtitution, muſt neceſſarily be confined to ſuch a *reſtrained* Senſe: Which be-

i *Matt.* XXVIII. 20. k *Matt.* XVIII. 20.

ing utterly uncapable of any certain Proof, the Argument built thereupon, muſt of Conſequence fall to the Ground. Seeing therefore, that there are two very conſiderable Flaws in the Argument, as proving *too much* one Way, and *too little* the other Way, it appears not prudent to reſt an otherwiſe clear Clauſe upon ſo precarious a Bottom, or to give the *Romaniſts* a very needleſs Handle for Triumph in this Article, when we have a Multitude of other Arguments, ſtrong and irreſiſtible, againſt the *corporal* or local Preſence in the Holy Communion.

CHAP. IV.

As to the *Continuance* of the Euchariſtical Service till our *Lord comes*, there is a plain Reaſon for it, becauſe the *Chriſtian* Diſpenſation is bound up in it, and muſt expire with it. And there is no Neceſſity of ſuppoſing, as ſome do[1], any Alluſion to the *Abſence* of his *Body*. The Text does not ſay, *till his Body appears*, but *till He come:* That is, till He comes to put an *End* to this Sacramental Service (and to all other Services proper to a State of Probation) and to aſſign us our Reward. The Reference is to the *ultimate End*, where This and all other *probationary* Duties, as ſuch, muſt *ceaſe*, and to which they now *look*, expecting to be ſo *crowned*, and compleated: So that if there be an *Antitheſis* intended in the Words, it is between *pre-*

1 Quia *futuri* adventus Domini mentio ſit, palam eſt, quaſi *abſentis* deſiderium, & ut ita dicam, defectum ſuppleri, hac repreſentatione, & ob oculos poſitione *præteriti* ejus Beneficii, donec *ipſe adveniens* deſiderium hoc noſtrum impleat. *Przipcovius* ad 1 Cor. XI. 24.

ſent

CHAP. IV. *ſent Service* and *future Glory*, not between *preſent* and *abſent* Body.

HOWEVER, though the Argument will not bear in the View before mentioned, yet it is right and juſt to argue, that the *Sign*, or *Memorial* of any Thing, is not the *very Thing* ſignified, or commemorated, but is *diſtinct* from it. Bread and Wine, the *Symbols* of Chriſt's natural Body and Blood, are not literally that very *natural* Body and Blood; neither is the *Sacrament* of Chriſt's Paſſion literally the *Paſſion* itſelf: Thus far we may argue juſtly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, but ſuppoſing at the ſame Time, the *ſtrict* Senſe of the Word *Sacrament* to be the true one. The Argument is as good againſt the *Socinians* alſo, only by being tranſverſed: For, the *Things* ſignified and commemorated, are not the *Signs*, or *Memorials*, but ſomething elſe. And therefore, to make out the true Notion of Sacramental *Signs*, there muſt be *inward* and *inviſible Graces* as well as *outward viſible Signs*: Of which more in the Sequel.

HAVING done with the firſt and principal *End* of the Sacrament, namely, the *Commemoration* of Chriſt as deſcribed in Scripture, and of his *Death* according to the true *Sacrificial* Notion of it; I now proceed to ſhew *how* this Commemoration is performed, or by what kind of *Service* it is ſolemnized, and what is farther intimated, or effected in and by that Service.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

CHAP. V.

Of the Conſecration of the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion.

THE Firſt Thing we have to take Notice of in the Sacramental Service, is the *Conſecration* of the Elements: *Jeſus took Bread and bleſſed it* [m]. *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs* [n], &c. Here, the Points to be enquired into are, 1. Whether the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt are *really bleſſed, conſecrated, ſanctified*, and in what Senſe. 2. Suppoſing they are *bleſſed*, &c. by whom, or how they are ſo. 3. What the *Bleſſing*, or *Conſecration* amounts to.

1. THE Firſt Enquiry is, whether the Elements may be juſtly ſaid to be *bleſſed*, or *conſecrated:* For, This is a Point which I find diſputed by Some; not many, nor very conſiderable. *Smalcius*, a warm Man, and who ſeldom knew any Bounds, ſeems to have been of Opinion, that no proper, no ſacerdotal *Benediction* at all belonged to the Bread and Cup *before receiving*, nor indeed *after*; but that the Communicants, upon receiving the Elements, gave *Praiſe* to God, and that was all the *Benediction* which St. *Paul* ſpeaks of [o]. So, He denies

m *Matt.* XXVI. 26. n 1 *Cor.* X. 16.

o Notandum inſuper eſt, verba Pauli, *Calix Benedictionis*, non ſignificare *Calicem benedictum* (ut *Frantzius*, una cum Pontificiis, aliquid divinum ſibi & ſuis hac re arrogantibus, interpretatur) ſed

CHAP. V.

nies that any *Benediction* at all paſſed to the Elements. And He aſſerts beſides, that whatever *Benediction* there was, it was not ſo much from the Adminiſtrator, or officiating Miniſter, as from the *Communicants* themſelves: For which He has a weak Pretence from St. *Paul*'s Words, *We bleſs*, that is, ſays He, *We Communicants* do it. Thus far *Smalcius*. But the cooler and wiſer *Socinians* go not theſe Lengths. *Crellius* expreſsly allows, that a *Benediction* is conferred upon the *Cup*, as it is *ſanctified* by Thankſgiving, and made a kind of *Libation* unto God [p]. He goes farther, and diſtinguiſhes Sacramental Conſecration from That of *Common Meals*, as amounting to a *Sanctification* of the Elements for high and ſacred Purpoſes [q]. The *Racovian* Catechiſm allows alſo of a *Sanctification* of the Elements, made by Prayer and Thankſgiving [r]. *Wol-*

Calicem, *quo ſumpto benedicimus:* Mox enim additur, quem *benedicimus*, nempe *omnes* qui ad menſam Domini accedimus.
Valent. Smal. contr. Frantz. p. 331.

p Benedictio autem iſta refertur primum ad Deum & Chriſtum, & in Gratiarum Actione (unde etiam hic ritus antiquitus *Euchariſtiæ* nomen obtinuit) conſiſtit: Sed ſimul etiam *tranſit ad Calicem*, quatenus Divini nominis Benedictione & Gratiarum Actione *ſanctificatur* Calix iſte, & ſic Domino quodammodo libatur.
Crellius in 1 *Cor.* X. 16. opp. Tom. II. p. 306.

q Non tantum eam Gratiarum Actionem, quæ etiam in *vulgari* ciborum & potus uſu adhibetur, intelligi arbitramur, qua ſcilicet Gratiæ aguntur pro poculo iſto; ſed maxime eam qua Gratiæ aguntur *pro Chriſti fuſo pro nobis ſanguine*. Hac enim Gratiarum Actione imprimis poculum iſtud, quo ad Chriſti Sanguinis fuſionem repræſentandam utimur, *ſanctificatur & conſecratur*. *Crellius*, Ibid. p. 306.

r Qui Calici huic *benedicunt*, id eſt, *cum* Gratiarum Actione, & nominis Domini celebratione *ſanctificant*, &c. Racov. Catech. Sect. VI. c. 4. p. 237. Edit. 1659.

CHAP. V.

zogenius, afterwards, ſeems to waver and fluctuate between *Inclination*, and *Reaſon*, and ſcarce knows where to fix; ſometimes admitting a *Conſecration* of the Elements, and ſoon after reſolving all into bare *giving of Thanks* to God [t]. I ſuppoſe, all his Heſitancy was owing to his not underſtanding the Notion of *relative Holineſs* (which he might have admitted, as *Crellius* did, conſiſtently with his other Principles) or to ſome Apprehenſion he was under, leſt the admitting of a real *Sanctification* ſhould infer ſome ſecret Operation of the *Holy Ghoſt*. However, to make *Scripture* bend to any *preconceived* Opinions, is not treating *ſacred* Writ with the Reverence which belongs to it. St. *Paul* is expreſs, that the *Cup*, meaning the Wine, is *bleſſed*, or ſanctified, in the Euchariſt: And if the *Wine* be really *ſanctified* in that ſolemn Service, no Man of tolerable Capacity can make any Queſtion as to the *Bread*, whether that be not *ſanctified* alſo.

IT is of ſmall Moment to plead that εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν are often uſed promiſcuouſly, and that the former properly ſignifies *giving Thanks*, and that Bread and Wine (for thus do ſome trifle) cannot be *thanked:* For, ſince the Words are often uſed promiſcuouſly, and ſince εὐλογεῖν is taken *tranſitively* in this very Caſe

t Vox *Benedicendi* —— ſignificat uſitatam illam Gratiarum Actionem, ſeu *Conſecrationem* Panis, &c. ——— Calicem *benedicere* eſt, Deum pro potu, qui eſt in Calice, extollere, eique Gratias agere. *Wolzog.* in Matt. XXVI. 26. p. 408.

CHAP. V.

by the Apoſtle[u], it is next to ſelf-evident that εὐχαριστεῖν, ſo far as concerns this Matter, cannot be taken in a Senſe *excluſive* of that *tranſitive* Signification of εὐλογεῖν: For to do that, is flatly to contradict the Apoſtle. No doubt but either of the Words may (as Circumſtances happen) ſignify no more than *thanking*, or *praiſing* God, but here it is manifeſt that, in this Rite, both God is *praiſed*, and the Elements *bleſſed:* Yea Both are done at the ſame Time, and in the ſelf-ſame Act; and the Apoſtle's Authority, without any Thing more, abundantly proves it. If the Reader deſires any Thing farther, in ſo plain a Caſe, he may pleaſe to conſult three very able Judges of *Biblical* Language, or of *Greek* Phraſes; *Buxtorf* I mean, and *Vorſtius*, and *Caſaubon*, who have clearly and fully ſettled the true Meaning of εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν, both in the *general*, and with reſpect to this *particular* Caſe: I ſhall refer[w] to the two firſt of them, and ſhall cite a few Words from the Third[x]. But to cut off all Pretence drawn from the ſtrict Senſe of εὐχαριστεῖν, as importing barely *Thankſgiving unto God*,

u 1 *Cor.* X. 16. Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν.

w *Buxtorf*, de Cœna Domini, p. 311. Conf. *Bucher.* Antiq. Evangel. p. 369. *Johan. Vorſtius* de Hebraiſm. N. T. Part. I. p. 166, &c.

x Evangeliſtæ & Apoſtolus Paulus — duobus verbis *promiſcue* utuntur, ad declarandam Domini Actionem, εὐλογεῖν, & εὐχαριστεῖν. — utraque vox a parte una, totam Domini Actionem deſignat: Nam Chriſtus in *eodem actu*, & Deum Patrem *laudavit*, & *gratias* ei egit, & hoc amplius panem *ſanctificavit*; hoc eſt, *conſecravit* in uſum Sacramenti, &c. Caſaub. Exercit. XVI. p. 517. Conf. p. 533. & *Albertin.* de Euchariſt, L. I. c. IV. p. 8, &c.

it

it may be obſerved, that That Word alſo is often uſed *tranſitively*[y], as well as εὐλογεῖν, and then it imports, or includes *Benediction*: So far from Truth is it, that it muſt neceſſarily *exclude* it. I may farther add, that the *Benedictions* uſed[z] in the *Paſchal* Solemnity may be an uſeful Comment upon the *Benediction* in the Euchariſt. There the *laying Hand* upon the Bread, and the *taking up* the Cup, were ſignificant Intimations of a *Bleſſing* transferred to the Bread and Wine, in virtue of the Thankſgiving-Service at the ſame Time performed. And by the Way, from hence may be underſtood what St. *Chryſoſtom* obſerves upon 1 *Cor.* X. 16. *The Cup of Bleſſing, which we bleſs*, &c. on which He thus comments: "He called it "the *Cup of Bleſſing*, becauſe while we *hold it* "*in our Hands*, we ſend up our Hymns of Praiſe "to God, ſtruck with Admiration and Aſto-"niſhment at the ineffable Gift, *&c*[a]. That Circum-

CHAP. V.

y Εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτος — εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. *Juſt. Mart.* Apol. 1. p. 96. conf. 98. πολήρια εὐχαριστεῖν —— τοῦ (ποτηρίου) εὐχαριστημένου. *Iren.* Lib. I. c. XIII. p. 60. ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσιν. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. 1. p. 375.

Note that for the expreſſing this *tranſitive* Senſe of the Greek Word, ſome have contrived, not improperly, the Engliſh Word *Euchariſtize*, importing *Thankſgiving* towards God, but ſo as at the ſame Time to expreſs the *Benediction* imparted to the Elements in the ſame Act.

z See above Ch. 2. p. 66.

a Ποτήριον δὲ εὐλογίας ἐκάλεσεν, ἐπειδὰν αὐτὸ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχοντες, ὕτως αὐτὸν ἀνυμνοῦμεν, θαυμάζοντες, ἐκπληττόμενοι τῆς ἀφάτου δωρεᾶς. κ. τ. λ.

Note, though *Chryſoſtom* here makes mention of Hymns only, in accounting for the Name of *Eulogy*, or *Bleſſing*, yet he did not mean that Hymns only were uſed at that Time in *conſecrating*,

CHAP. V.

Circumſtance of holding the Thing *in Hand* while the *Prayers* or *Praiſes* were offering, was ſuppoſed to ſignify the Derivation of a *Benediction*, or *Conſecration* upon it. It is not material to diſpute, whether the Conſecration formerly was performed by *Thankſgiving*, or by *Prayer*, or by *Both* together: The *Forms* might differ in different Churches, or at different Times. But the Point which we are now conſidering is, whether a *Benediction* is really *conveyed* to the Elements in this Service, and whether they are really *ſanctified*, or *made Holy*. That they are ſo, is plain from the Teſtimony of St. *Paul* before recited.

2. As to *Smalcius*'s Pretence, before mentioned, concerning the *Benediction* of the *Communicants*, after their receiving the Elements, it is a groundleſs Fiction, and a violent perverting of the plain Meaning of the Text. In the Paſchal Service, the *Benediction* was performed by the *Maſter* of the *Feaſt* (not by the *whole* Company) and before *Diſtribution*: So was it likewiſe in the *Inſtitution* of this Sacrament, by *our Lord*. And all Antiquity is conſonant, that a *ſacerdotal* Bleſſing was *previous* to the delivering the ſacred Symbols [c], made *ſacred*

for he elſewhere plainly ſpeaks of Prayer beſides, *Prayer* for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt.

Ὅτ' ἂν δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κάλῃ, καὶ τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ἐπιτελῇ θυσίαν, καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων συνεχῶς ἐφάπτηται δεσπότου, πῶς τάξομεν αὐτὸν, εἰπέ μοι; de Sacerdot. l. VI. c. 4. p. 424. Ed. Bened. Compare *Theophyl.* on *John* VI. who ſpeaks as fully to the ſame Purpoſe.

c Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος πάντες τοῦ

ſacred by that Benediction. And this is confirmed from hence, (as before hinted) that an *unworthy* Communicant is guilty of *profane Irreverence*; viz. towards what is ſuppoſed *Holy*, before He receives it. As to St. *Paul*'s Expreſſion, *We bleſs*, it means no more than if He had ſaid, We *Chriſtians* bleſs, meaning, by the *proper Officers*. To ſtrain a common Idiom of Speech to the utmoſt Rigour, is not right: It might as well be pleaded, that St. *Paul* muſt be preſent in Perſon, at every Conſecration; for ordinarily, when a Man ſays *We*, He includes *Himſelf* in the Number. It muſt be owned, that it depends upon the *Diſpoſition* of every Communicant, to render the *previous* Conſecration either *ſalutary*, or *noxious* to Himſelf: And if any Man has a Mind to call a *worthy* Reception of the Elements, *a Conſecration* of them to Himſelf, a ſecondary Conſecration, He may [d]; for it would not be worth while to hold a Diſpute about Words. But ſtrictly ſpeaking, it is not within the Power, or Choice of a Communicant, either to *conſecrate* or to *deſecrate* the Symbols, to make the Sacrament a *common* Meal, or otherwiſe: It is a *religious*, CHAP. V.

τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος. *Juſt. Mart.* p. 96. See ABp. *Potter* on Church Government, p. 262, &c.

d Igitur non Sacrificia *ſanctificant* Hominem, non enim indiget Sacrificio Deus: Sed *Conſcientia* ejus qui offert, *ſanctificat Sacrificium*, pura exiſtens, &c. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 18. p. 250.

N. B. Here, *Sanctifying* Means rendring *ſalutary*: Not that That *alone* does it, but it is a Condition *ſine qua non*.

CHAP. V. and *ſacred* Meal even to the moſt unworthy; and that is the Reaſon why ſuch are liable to the Judgment of God for abuſing it: For, if it were really a *common Meal* to them, it would do them no more *Hurt*, than any other ordinary Entertainment. *Holy* Things are fit for *holy* Perſons, and will turn to their Nutriment and Increaſe: But to the *unholy* and *profane*, if they preſume to come near, the ſanctified Inſtruments do as certainly turn to their Detriment and Condemnation. There are Proofs of this, in great Abundance, quite through the Old Teſtament, and I need not point out to the Reader what He may every where find.

ONE Thing more I may note here in paſſing, for the preventing Cavils, or Miſtakes. When we ſpeak of *Human* Benedictions, and their *Efficacy*, we mean not that they have any real Virtue, or Efficacy in *themſelves*, or under any Conſideration but as founded in *divine* Promiſe or Contract, and as coming *from* God *by* Man. If the Prayer of Faith *ſaved* the *Sick* [e], it was not properly the *Human* Prayer that did it, but *God* did it *by* or upon ſuch Prayer, purſuant to his Promiſe. In like Manner, whatever *Conſecration*, or *Benediction*, or *Sanctification* is imparted in the Sacrament to *Things*, or *Perſons*, it is all God's doing; and the ground of all ſtands in the *divine* Warrant authorizing Men to adminiſter the Holy Communion, in the *divine* Word intimating the Effect of it, and in the *divine* Promiſe and Covenant, ta-

[e] *James* V. 15.

cit

cit or expreſs [f], to ſend his Bleſſing along with it. CHAP. V.

3. THE Third and moſt material Article of Enquiry is, what the *Conſecration* of the Elements really *amounts to*, or what the *Effect* of it is? To which we anſwer, thus much at leaſt is certain, that the Bread and Wine being *ſanctified by the Word of God, and Prayer* [g] (according to the Apoſtle's *general* Rule, applicable in an eminent Manner to this *particular* Caſe) do thereby contract a *relative Holineſs*, or *Sanctification*, in ſome Degree, or other. What the *Degree* is, is no where preciſely determined; but the Meaſures of it may be competently taken from the *Ends* and *Uſes* of the Service, from the near *Relation* it bears to our *Lord's Perſon*, (a Perſon of infinite Dignity) and from the *Judgments* denounced againſt *irreverent* Offenders, and perhaps from ſome other Conſiderations to be mentioned as we go along.

FOR the clearer Conception of this Matter, we may take a brief Survey of what *relative Holineſs* meant under the Old Teſtament, and of the *various Degrees* of it. I ſhall ſay nothing

f I ſay, *tacit* or expreſs: Becauſe our Lord's declaring, and St. *Paul*'s declaring *what is done* in the Euchariſt, do amount to a tacit *Promiſe* of what ſhall be done always. Wherefore, the *Socinians* do but trifle with us, when they call for an *expreſs* Promiſe. Are not the Words, *This is my Body*, &c. and *is it not the Communion*, &c. tantamount to a *Divine Promiſe* of every Thing we contend for? But this is not the Place to explain that whole Matter: Thus much is evident, that *what the Word of Prayer did once make* the Sacramental *Bread* and Wine to be, That it will always make it.

g 1 *Tim.* IV. 5.

of

CHAP. V.

of the relative Holineſs of *Perſons*, but of what belonged to *inanimate Things*, which is moſt to our preſent Purpoſe. The *Court* of the Temple was *holy* [h], the *Temple* itſelf *more holy*, and the *Sanctuary*, or *Holy of Holies*, was ſtill more ſo [i]: But the *Ark* of God, laid up in the Sanctuary, appears to have been yet *holier* than all. The *Holineſs* of the *Ark* was ſo great, and ſo tremendous, that many were ſtruck dead at once, only for preſuming to look into it with Eyes impure [k]: And *Uzzah* but for touching it (tho' with a pious Intent to preſerve it from falling) was inſtantly ſmitten of God, and died upon the Spot [l]. Whatever God is once pleaſed to *ſanctify* by his more peculiar *Preſence*, or to claim a more ſpecial *Property* in, or to *ſeparate* to *ſacred* Uſes, That is *relatively Holy*, as having a nearer *Relation* to God; and it muſt of courſe be treated with a *Reverence* and *Awe* ſuitable. Be the Thing what it will, be it otherwiſe ever ſo mean and contemptible in itſelf, yet as ſoon as God gives it a *ſacred* Relation, and, as it were, ſeals it with his own Signet, it muſt then be looked upon with an Eye of Reverence, and treated with an awful Reſpect, for fear of treſpaſſing againſt the *divine Majeſty*, in making That *common* which God has *ſanctified*.

h 1 *Kings* VIII. 64.

i The *Rabbins* reckon up *Ten Degrees* of ſuch relative Holineſs. Vid. *Deylingius*, Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 546.

k 1 *Sam.* VI. 19.

l 2 *Sam.* VI. 7. 1 *Chron.* XIII. 9, 10.

THIS

THIS Notion of *relative Holineſs* is a very eaſy and intelligible Notion: Or if it wanted any further Illuſtration, might be illuſtrated from familiar Examples in a lower Kind, of *relative Sacredneſs* accruing to inanimate Things by the Relation they bear to *Earthly Majeſty*. The *Thrones*, or *Scepters*, or *Crowns*, or *Preſence-Rooms* of Princes are, in this lower Senſe, *relatively* Sacred: And an Offence may be committed againſt the Majeſty of the Sovereign, by an *Irreverence* offered to what ſo peculiarly belong to Him. If any one ſhould aſk, what is *conveyed* to the reſpective Things to make them *holy*, or *ſacred?* we might aſk, in our Turn, what was *conveyed* to the Ground which *Moſes* once ſtood upon, to make it *Holy Ground* [m]? Or what was *conveyed* to the *Gold* which the Temple was ſaid to *ſanctify* [n], or what to the *Gift* when the Altar *ſanctified* it [o]? But to anſwer more directly, as to Things common becoming *holy* or *ſacred*, I ſay, a holy or ſacred *Relation* is conveyed to them by their *Appropriation*, or Uſe; and that ſuffices. The Things are *in themſelves* juſt what they before were [p]: But now they are conſidered by *reaſonable* Creatures, as coming under *new* and *ſacred* Rela-

CHAP. V.

m *Exod.* III. 5. n *Matt.* XXIII. 17.
o *Matt.* XXIII. 19.
p "When certain Things are ſaid to be *holy* or *ſacred*, no "moral Quality of Holineſs inheres in the *Things*, only an *Obli-* "*gation* is laid upon *Men*, to treat them in ſuch a particular Man- "ner: And when that Obligation ceaſes, they are ſuppoſed to "fall again into promiſcuous and ordinary Uſe. *Puſendorf.* Law of Nature, Ch. I. concerning *moral Entities*.

tions,

CHAP. V.

tions, which have their *moral* Effect; inſomuch that now the Honour of the *divine* Majeſty in one Caſe, or of *Royal* in the other Caſe, becomes deeply intereſted in them.

LET us next apply theſe general Principles to the particular Inſtance of *relative Holineſs* ſuppoſed to be conveyed to the Symbols of Bread and Wine by their *Conſecration*. They are now no more *common* Bread and Wine (at leaſt not during this their *ſacred* Application) but the Communicants are to conſider the *Relation* which they bear, and the *Uſes* which they ſerve to. I do not here ſay *what*, becauſe I have no Mind to anticipate what more properly belongs to another Head, or to a diſtinct Chapter hereafter: But in the *general* I obſerve, that they contract a *relative Holineſs*[q] by their Conſecration, and that is the *Effect*. Hence it is, that ſome Kinds of *Irreverence* towards theſe *ſacred* Symbols, amount to being *guilty of the Body and Blood* of the Lord[r], the Lord of Glory; and hence alſo it was that many of the *Corinthians*, in the Apoſtolical Age, were puniſhed as ſeverely for offering *Contempt* to this holy Solemnity, as others formerly were for their Irreverence towards the *Ark* of God: That is to ſay, They were ſmitten of God with *Diſeaſes*, and *Death*[s].

q The Ancients therefore frequently gave the Title of *Holy*, *Holy of the Lord*, or even *Holy of Holies*, and the like, to the Sacred Elements. Teſtimonies are collected by *Suicer*. Tom. I. 56, 62. *Albertin*. p. 345, 346, 376. *Grabe*. Spicil. Tom. I. p. 343.

r 1 *Cor*. XI. 27. s 1 *Cor*. XI. 30.

ENOUGH

CHAP. V.

ENOUGH hath been ſaid for the explaining the *general* Nature or Notion of *relative Holineſs*: Or if the Reader deſires more, He may conſult Mr. *Mede*, who profeſſedly conſiders the Subject more at large [t]. Such a *relative Holineſs* does undoubtedly belong to the Elements once *conſecrated*. The ancient *Fathers* are ſtill more particular in expounding the ſacerdotal *Conſecration*, and the divine *Sanctification* conſequent thereupon. Their ſeveral Sentiments have been carefully collected, and uſeful Remarks added, by the learned *Pfaffius* [u]. It may be proper here to give ſome brief Account of their Way of explaining this Matter, and to conſider what Judgment it may be reaſonable to make of it. Mr. *Aubertine* has judiciouſly reduced their Sentiments of *Conſecration* to *three* Heads, as follows [w]: 1. The Power of *Chriſt* and the *Holy Spirit*, as the *principal*, or properly *efficient* Cauſe. 2. *Prayers*, *Thankſgivings*, *Benedictions*, as the *conditional* Cauſe, or *inſtrumental*. 3. The *Words* of our Lord, *This is my Body*, *This is my Blood*, as *declarative* of what then was, *promiſſory* of what ſhould be always. I ſhall throw in a few Remarks upon the ſeveral Heads in their Order.

1. As to the Power of *Chriſt*, and the *Holy Spirit* (in Conjunction with God the Father)

t *Mede*'s Works, p. 399, &c. and 823. *Diſſertationum Triga*. Lond. A. D. 1653.

u *Pfaffius* Diſſert. de Conſecratione veterum Euchariſtica, p. 355. Compare *L'Arroque* Hiſt. of the Euchariſt, Part. I. Ch. VIII. p. 65, &c.

w *Albertin.* de Euchariſt, L. 1. c. 7. p. 34.

I ſuppoſe

CHAP. V.

I ſuppoſe, the Ancients might infer their joint Operations in the *Sacraments*, partly from the *general* Doctrine of Scripture relating to their joint Concurrence in promoting Man's Salvation[x], and partly from their being jointly *honoured* or *worſhipped* in Sacramental Services[y]; and partly alſo from what is particularly taught in Scripture with reſpect to our *Lord*'s Concern in the Euchariſt, or the *Holy Spirit*'s. It is obſervable that the Doctrine of the Fathers, with regard to *Conſecration*, was much the ſame in relation to the *Waters* of Baptiſm, as in relation to the *Elements* in the Euchariſt. They ſuppoſed a kind of *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to *ſanctify* the Waters in one, and the *Symbols* in the other, to the *Uſes* intended: And They ſeem to have gone upon this *general* Scripture-Principle (beſides particular Texts relating to each Sacrament) that the Holy Ghoſt is the immediate Fountain of all *Sanctification*. I believe, they were right in the main Thing, only not always accurate in *Expreſſion*. Had they ſaid, that the *Holy Ghoſt* came upon the *Reci-*

x *Matt.* XXVIII. 18, 19. *John* XIV. 16, 26. *Rom.* V. 5, 6. 1 *Cor.* XII. 4, 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* I. 21, 22. XIII. 14. *Epheſ.* I. 17, 21, 22. 2 *Theſſ.* II. 13, 14. *Tit.* III. 4, 5, 6. 1 *Pet.* I. 2.

y *Baptiſm* in the Name of all Three. *Matt.* XXVIII. 19. *As to the Euchariſt, Juſtin Martyr* is an early Witneſs, that the Cuſtom was to make mention of all the *Three Perſons* in that Service.

Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος, καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει. Apol. 1. p. 96.

pients,

pients, in the *due Uſe* of the Sacraments, they had ſpoken with greater Exactneſs; and perhaps it was all that they really meant. They could not be aware of the Diſputes which might ariſe in after Times, nor think themſelves obliged to a philoſophical Strictneſs of Expreſſion. It was all one with them to ſay, in a confuſe general Way, either that the Holy Ghoſt ſanctified the *Receivers*, *in the Uſe of the outward Symbols*, or that He *ſanctified the Symbols to their Uſe*: For either Expreſſion ſeemed to amount to the ſame Thing; tho' in Strictneſs, there is a conſiderable Difference between them. What Mr. *Hooker* very judiciouſly ſays, of the *real Preſence* of Chriſt in the Sacrament, appears to be equally applicable to the *Preſence* of the *Holy Spirit* in the ſame: "It is not to "be ſought for in the *Sacrament*, but in the "*worthy Receiver* of the Sacrament. —— As "for the Sacraments they really *exhibit*; but "for ought we can gather out of that which "is written of them, they are not really, nor "do really contain in themſelves *that Grace* "which with them, or by them, it pleaſeth "God to beſtow[z]." Not that I conceive there is any Abſurdity in ſuppoſing a peculiar Preſence of the Holy Ghoſt to *inanimate* Things, any more than in God's appearing in a burning-Buſh[a]: But there is no Proof of the Fact,

CHAP. V.

z *Hooker*, Eccl. Polity, B. V. p. 307, 308. ABp. *Cranmer* had ſaid the ſame Thing before, in his *Preface* to his Book againſt *Gardiner*: I ſhall have another Occaſion, lower down, for citing his Words, Conf. *Sam. Ward* Determinat. Theolog. p. 62.

a *Exod.* III. 2. *Acts* VII. 30.

either

CHAP. V.

either from direct Scripture, or from That in Conjunction with the Reaſon of the Thing. The *relative Holineſs* of the Elements, or Symbols, as explained above, is very intelligible, without this other Suppoſition: And as to the reſt, it is all more rationally accounted for (as we ſhall ſee hereafter) by the Preſence of the Holy Spirit with the *worthy Receivers*, in the *Uſe* of the Symbols, than by I know not what Preſence or Union with the Symbols themſelves [b].

2. THE ſecond Article, mentioned by *Albertinus*, relates to *Prayers*, *Thankſgivings*, and *Benedictions*, conſidered as *inſtrumental* in Conſecration. It has been a Queſtion, whether the earlier Fathers (thoſe of the three firſt Centuries) allowed of any proper *Prayer*, as diſtinct from *Thankſgiving*, in the Euchariſtical Conſecration. I think they did, though the Point is ſcarce worth diſputing, ſince they plainly allowed of a *Sanctification* of the Elements, conſequent upon what was done by the officiating Miniſter. But we may examine a few Authorities, and as briefly as poſſible.

Juſtin Martyr, more than once, calls the *conſecrated* Elements by the Name of *Euchariſtized* Food [c], which looks as if he thought that the *Thankſgiving* was the *Conſecration*: But yet he

b Vid. *Voſſius* de Sacrament. vi & efficacia, A. D. 1648. Tom. VI. p. 252. de Bapt. Diſſ. V. p. 274. Harmon. Evangel. 233. A. D. 1656.

c Εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου ——— εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. Apol. I. p. 96.

commonly makes mention both of *Prayers*, and *Thankſgiving* [d], where he ſpeaks of the Euchariſtical Service; from whence it appears probable, or *certain* rather, that *Conſecration*, at that Time, was perform'd by *Both*.

Irenæus [e] ſpeaks of the *Bread* as receiving the *Invocation of God*, and thereby becoming more than *common* Bread. Some would interpret it of *Prayer* for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* [f]; but, as I apprehend, without ſufficient Authority. *Irenæus* might mean no more than *calling* upon *God*, in any kind of *Prayer*, or *Thankſgiving*, or in ſuch as *Juſtin Martyr* before Him had referred to. *Irenæus*, in the ſame Chapter, twice ſpeaks of *Thankſgiving* [g], as uſed before, or at the Conſecration: But nothing can be certainly inferred from thence, as to his *excluding Prayer*, and reſolving the Conſecration into bare *Thankſgiving*.

Origen has expreſſed this whole Matter with as much Judgment and Exactneſs, as one ſhall any where meet with among the ancient Fathers. He had been conſidering our Lord's Words: *Not that which goeth into the Mouth, defileth a Man* [h]; upon which He immediate-

d Λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας. Apol. 1. p 19. τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν. Ibid. p. 96. εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας. 98. εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι. Dial. p. 387.

e Ὁ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία. *Iren.* l. IX. c. 18. p. 251.

f *Pfaffius* in Præfat. ad Fragm. anecdota & in Lib. p. 96.

g Offerens ei cum Gratiarum Actione—Panem in quo Gratiæ actæ ſint. *Iren.* p. 251.

h *Matt.* XV. 11.

CHAP. IV.

ly thought with Himſelf, that by Parity of Reaſon, it might as juſtly be ſaid, that what *goes into the Mouth*, cannot *ſanctify* a Man. And yet here He was aware, that according to the vulgar Way of conceiving, or ſpeaking, the Sacramental Elements of Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, were ſuppos'd to *ſanctify* the Receiver, having themſelves been *ſanctified* before in their Conſecration. This was true in ſome Senſe, and according to a popular way of ſpeaking; and therefore could not be denied by *Origen*, without wary, and proper Diſtinctions. He allows, in the firſt Place, that the Elements were really *ſanctified*; namely, by *the Word of God, and Prayer*[i]: But He denies that what is ſo ſanctified, *ſanctifies* any Perſon by its *own proper Virtue*[k], or conſider'd according to its *Matter*, which goes in at the Mouth, and is caſt off in the draught; admitting however, that the *Prayer* and *Word* (that is, God by them) do *enlighten* the *Mind*, and ſanctify the Heart, (for that is his Meaning) of the *worthy* Receiver. So, He reſolves the Virtue of the Sacrament, into the ſacerdotal *Conſecration*, previous to the *worthy* Reception: And He reckons *Prayer* (ſtrictly ſo called) as part of the Conſecration.

i Ἁγιαθέντι λόγῳ θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξει ἄρτου ——— τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως. *Orig.* in *Matt.* p. 254.

k Οὐ τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ ἁγιάζει τ χρώμενον. p. 253. κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν, εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχὴν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ὠφέλιμον γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ αἴτιον διαβλέψεως, ὁρῶντος ἐπὶ τὸ ὠφελοῦν. καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τ μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν. p. 254.

The

The Sum is, that the *Sanctification*, properly ſpeaking, goes to the *Perſon* fitly diſpoſed, and is the *Gift of God*, not the Work of the *outward* Elements, tho' *ſanctified* in a certain Senſe, as having been *conſecrated* to holy Uſes. Thus by carefully diſtinguiſhing upon the Caſe, He removed the Difficulty ariſing from a common and *popular* way of expreſſing it. Nevertheleſs, after this[1], in his lateſt and moſt correct Work, He did not ſcruple to make uſe of the ſame popular kind of Expreſſion, obſerving that the Euchariſtical Bread, by Prayer and Thankſgiving, was made a ſort of holy, or ſanctified *Body*, *ſanctifying* the worthy Receivers[m]. Where we may note, that He again takes in both *Prayer*, and *Thankſgiving*, to make the Conſecration. And we may obſerve another Thing, by the way, worth the noting, that by *Body* there, He does not underſtand our Lord's *natural* Body, but the *ſanctified Bread*, which He elſewhere calls the *Symbolical* and *Typical* Body[n]; that is to ſay, repreſentative Body, as diſtinguiſhed from the *real* Body, or *true Food* of the Soul,

CHAP. IV.

1 The Homilies on St. *Matthew* are ſuppoſed to have been written in the Year of our Lord 244. and his Book againſt *Celſus*, A. D. 249. *Origen* died in 253.

m Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τὸν μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν. σῶμα γινομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγιόν τι, καὶ ἁγιάζον τοὺς μετ' ὑγιοῦς προθέσεως αὐτῷ χρωμένους. *Origen.* contr. Celſ. L. VIII. p. 766. Edit. Bened.

n Ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος, πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σάρξ, καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν. *Origen.* in Matt. p. 254.

CHAP. V.

which none but the *Holy* partake of, and all that do ſo are *happy*. *Origen*'s Doctrine therefore, with reſpect to this Article, lies in theſe Particulars; 1. That the Bread and Wine, before Conſecration, are *common Food*. 2. That after Conſecration by Prayer and Thankſgiving, they become *Holy*, *Typical*, *Symbolical* Food, repreſentative of *true Food*. 3. That *unworthy* Receivers eat of the *Symbolical* Food only, without the *true*. 4. That *worthy* Receivers, upon eating the *Symbolical* Food, are *enlightened* and *ſanctified* from above, and conſequently do partake of the *true* Spiritual Food, in the ſame Act. I ſhall proceed no lower with the *Fathers*, under this Article, having ſaid as much as I conceive ſufficient for illuſtrating Mr. *Aubertine*'s ſecond Particular.

3. THE Third will ſtill want ſome Explication: Where we are to conſider, what Effect the Words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, are conceived *now* to have, in the Euchariſtical *Conſecration*. It is not meant (as the *Romaniſts* are pleaſed to interpret) that the pronouncing thoſe Words makes the Conſecration: But the Words *then* ſpoken by our bleſſed Lord, are conceiv'd to operate now, as virtually carrying in them a *Rule*, or a *Promiſe*, for all ſucceeding Ages of the Church, that what was *then* done when our Lord Himſelf *adminiſtred*, or *conſecrated*, will be *always* done in the Celebration of the Euchariſt, purſuant to That Original. If the Elements were then *ſanctified* or conſecrated into repreſentative Symbols of

of Chriſt's Body and Blood, and if the worthy Receivers were then underſtood to partake of the *true Spiritual* Food, upon receiving the *Symbolical*; and if all this was then *implied* in the Words, *This is my Body*, &c. ſo it is now. What the Sacrament then was, in Meaning, Virtue, and Effect, the ſame it is alſo at this Day. Such was the way of reaſoning which ſome of the *Fathers* made uſe of; and it appears to have been perfectly right and juſt. It was with this View, or under this Light, that they took upon them to ſay, that our Lord's Words *then* ſpoken, were to have their Effect in every *Conſecration* after; namely, as being directly *declaratory* of what then was, and virtually *promiſſory* of what ſhould be in like Caſe for all Times to come. The ſame Lord is our High-Prieſt in Heaven, recommending and inforcing our *Prayers* there, and ſtill conſtantly ratifying what He once ſaid, *This is my Body*, &c. For, like as the Words once ſpoken, *increaſe and multiply, and repleniſh the Earth*, have their Effect at this Day, and in all Ages of the World; ſo the Words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, tho' ſpoken but *once* by Him, ſtand in full Force and Virtue, and will ever do ſo, in all Ages of the Chriſtian Church. This is the Sum of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Reaſoning upon this Head; which it may ſuffice barely to refer to [o]: Mr. *Pfaffius* has collected from him what was moſt material, illuſtrating all with proper Re-

CHAP. V.

o *Chryſoſt.* Homil. . de *Proditione Judæ*, p. 384. Tom. II. Ed. Bened

CHAP. V.

marks [p]. The uſe I would farther make of the Notion is, to endeavour from hence to explain ſome ſhort and obſcure Hints of the elder *Fathers*. For Example, *Juſtin Martyr* ſpeaks of the Elements being *Euchariſtized* or *bleſſed* by the Prayer of the *Word* that came from Him [q] [God.] Why might not He mean the very ſame Thing that *Chryſoſtom* does, namely, that Chriſt our High-Prieſt above, now ratifies what He once ſaid on Earth, when he *bleſſed* the Elements with his Conſecration-Prayers, in the *Inſtitution* of the Euchariſt? It is He that *now* ſanctifies the *Symbols*, as He *then* did, and, as it were, preſides over our Euchariſtical Services, making the Bread to become *holy*, which before was *common*, and giving the *true Food*, to as many as are qualified to receive it, along with the *Symbolical*; that is, giving *Himſelf* to dwell in us, as we alſo in him. There is another the like obſcure Hint in *Irenæus*, which may probably be beſt interpreted after the ſame way. He ſuppoſes the Elements to become *Chriſt's Body* by receiving *the Word* [r]. He throws two Conſiderations into one, and does not diſtinguiſh ſo accurately as *Origen* afterwards did,

p *Pfaffius* de Conſecratione vet. Euchariſtica, p. 389. &c. Compare *Bingham* B. XIV. Ch. 3 §. 11. *Albertin*. L. 1. c. 7. p. 33. and *Covel*'s Account of the Greek Church, p. 47, 48, 63, &c.

q Τὴν δ' εὐχῆς λόγῳ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. *Juſt. Mart.* p. 96. conf. *Albertin.* p. 31.

r Ὅτότε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ. &c. *Iren.* L. V. c. II. p. 294.

——προσλαμβάνει τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται. Ibid.

between

between the *Symbolical* Food, and the *true Food*. In ſtrictneſs, the Elements firſt become *ſanctified* (in ſuch a Senſe as inanimate Things may) by *Conſecration* purſuant to our Lord's Inſtitution, and which our Lord ſtill ratifies; and thus they are made the *repreſentative* Body of Chriſt: But they are at the ſame Time to *worthy Receivers* made the Means of their Spiritual Union with Chriſt Himſelf; which *Irenæus* points at in what He ſays of the *Bread*'s receiving the *Logos*, but ſhould rather have ſaid it of the *Communicants* themſelves, as receiving the *Spiritual* Preſence of Chriſt, in the worthy *uſe* of the *ſacred* Symbols. But this Matter muſt come over again, and be diſtinctly conſidered at large. All I had to do here, was, to fix the true Notion of *Conſecration*, in as clear and diſtinct a Manner as I could. The Sum is, that the *Conſecration* of the Elements makes them *holy Symbols*, relatively holy, on account of their *relation* to what they repreſent, or point to, by *divine* Inſtitution: And it is *God* that gives them this *Holineſs* by the Miniſtry of the Word. The *Sanctification* of the Communicants (which is *God*'s Work alſo) is of *diſtinct* Conſideration from the former, tho' they are often confounded: And to this Part belongs what has been improperly called making the Symbols become our *Lord's Body*; and which really means making them his Body *to us*; or more plainly ſtill, making us Partakers of our Lord's *broken Body* and *Blood ſhed* at the ſame Time that we receive the *holy* Symbols; which

CHAP. V.

CHAP. V.

we are to explain in the Sequel. I ſhall only remark farther here, what naturally follows from all going before, that the Conſecration, or Sanctification of the *Elements* in this Service, is *abſolute*, and *univerſal*, for the Time being; and therefore all that communicate *unworthily* are chargeable with *profaning* Things *holy*: But the Sanctification of *Perſons* is *hypothetical*, and *particular*, depending upon the *Diſpoſitions* which the Communicants bring with them to the Lord's Table.

HAVING done with the *Conſecration* of the Elements, I ſhould now proceed to the *Diſtribution*, and *Manducation*. But as there is a *Sacramental* Feeding, and a *Spiritual* Feeding; and as the *Spiritual* is the *nobler* of the two, and of *chief* concern, and what the other principally or ſolely *looks to*, I conceive it will be proper to treat of this firſt: And becauſe the VI*th* Chapter of St. *John* contains the Doctrine of *Spiritual* Feeding, as delivered by our Lord himſelf, a Twelvemonth, or more, before He inſtituted the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, I ſhall make That the Subject of the next Chapter.

CHAP. VI.

Of Spiritual Eating and Drinking, as taught in JOHN VI.

THE Diſcourſe which our Lord had at *Capernaum*, about the *eating* his *Fleſh*, and *drinking* his *Blood*, is very remarkable, and deſerves

deſerves our cloſeſt Attention. His ſtrong way of expreſſing Himſelf, and his emphatical repeating the ſame Thing, in the ſame, or in different Phraſes, are alone ſufficient to perſuade us, that ſome very *important* Myſtery, ſome very *ſignificant* Leſſon of Inſtruction is contained in what He ſaid, in that Chapter, from Verſe the *27th* to Verſe the *63d* inclusive. CHAP. VI.

FOR the right underſtanding of that Diſcourſe, we muſt take our Marks from ſome of the *critical* Parts of it, and from other explanatory Places of Scripture. From Verſe the *63d*, as well as from the Nature of the Thing, we may learn, that the Diſcourſe is moſtly *myſtical*, and ought to be *ſpiritually*, not literally underſtood [f]. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing: The Words that I ſpeak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* I am aware, that this Text has been variouſly interpreted [t], and that it is not very eaſy to *aſcertain* the Conſtruction, ſo as not to leave room even for reaſonable doubt. I chooſe that Interpretation which appears moſt natural, and which has good Countenance from *Antiquity*, and many judicious Interpreters [u]: But the *Rea-*

f *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. VII. p. 225.
Euſebius de Eccl. Theol. L. 3. c. 12.
Cyrill. Hieroſol. Catech. XVI. p. 251. Myſtag. IV. 321.
Chryſoſtom. in loc.
Athanaſius ad Serap. Ep. IV. p. 710. Ed. Bened.
Auguſtinus in Pſalm. 98.

t Vid. *Albertin.* de Euchariſt. p. 243. &c.

u Vid. *Albertin.* p. 244.

ſon

CHAP. VI.

ſon of the *Thing* is ſufficient to ſatisfy us, that a great Part of this Diſcourſe of our Lord's cannot be *literally* interpreted, but muſt admit of ſome *figurative*, or *myſtical* Conſtruction.

A SURER mark for interpreting our Lord's Meaning in this Chapter, is the *univerſality* of the Expreſſions which He made uſe of, both in the *affirmative* and *negative* Way. *If any Man eat of this Bread, He ſhall live for ever*[w]. *Whoſo eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life*[x], ——*dwelleth in me, and I in him*[y]. So far in the affirmative or poſitive way: The Propoſitions are *univerſal Affirmatives*, as the Schools ſpeak. The like may be obſerved in the *negative* way: *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*[z]. The Sum is: *All* that feed upon what is here mentioned have Life; and *all* that do not feed thereupon have no Life. Hence ariſes an Argument againſt interpreting the Words of *Sacramental Feeding* in the Euchariſt. For it is not true, that all who receive the Communion have Life, unleſs we put in the Reſtriction of *worthy*, and *ſo far*. Much leſs can it be true, that all who never have, or never ſhall receive, have not Life: Unleſs we make ſeveral more Reſtrictions, confining the Propoſition to Perſons living *ſince* the Time of the Inſtitution, and Perſons *capable*, and not deſtitute of *Opportunity*; making Exceptions for good Men *of old*, and for *Infants*,

w *John* VI. 51.
x *John* VI. 54.
y *John* VI. 56.
z *John* VI. 53.

and

and for many who have been or may be *invincibly* ignorant, or might never have it in their Power to receive the Communion, or to know any Thing of it. Now an Interpretation which muſt be clogg'd with a multitude of Reſtrictions to make it bear, if at all, is ſuch as one would not chooſe (other Circumſtances being equal) in preference to what is clogg'd with *fewer*, or with *none*[a].

CHAP. VI.

SHOULD we interpret the Words, of *Faith in Chriſt*, there muſt be *Reſtrictions* in that Caſe alſo; *viz.* to Thoſe who have *heard* of Chriſt, and who do not only believe in Him, but *live* according to his Laws. And Exceptions muſt be made for many good Men of old, who either knew nothing of Chriſt, or very obſcurely; as likewiſe for *Infants*, and *Idiots*; and perhaps alſo for many who are in utter Darkneſs without any Fault of theirs: So that this Conſtruction comes not fully up to the *univerſality* of the Expreſſions made uſe of by our Lord.

BUT if neither of theſe can anſwer, in that reſpect, is there any other Conſtruction that will; or what is it? Yes, there is one, which will compleatly anſwer in point of *univerſality*, and it is this: All that ſhall finally *ſhare* in the Death, Paſſion, and Atonement of Chriſt, are *ſafe*; and all that have not a Part therein, are *loſt*[b]. All

a Conf. *Albertin.* de Euchariſt. p. 234, 235.

b *Niſi manducaveritis*, inquit, Carnem Filii Hominis, & Sanguinem *biberitis*, *non habebitis vitam in vobis*. Facinus, vel Flagitium videtur jubere: Figura eſt ergo, præcipiens *paſſioni* Dominicæ communicandum, & ſuaviter atque utiliter recondendum in

CHAP. VI. All that are *ſaved*, owe their Salvation to the *ſalutary* Paſſion of Chriſt: And their *partaking* thereof (which is *feeding* upon his *Fleſh* and *Blood)* is their *Life*. On the other hand, as many as are excluded from *ſharing* therein, and therefore feed not upon the Atonement, have no Life in them. Thoſe who are bleſſed with Capacity and Opportunities, muſt have *Faith*, muſt have *Sacraments*, muſt be in *Covenant*, muſt receive and obey the Goſpel, in order to have the *Expiation* of the Death of Chriſt *applied* to them: But our Lord's *general* Doctrine, in this Chapter, ſeems to *abſtract* from all Particularities, and to reſolve into This; that whether with *Faith* or without, whether in the *Sacraments* or out of the *Sacraments*, whether *before* Chriſt or *ſince*, whether in *Covenant* or out of *Covenant*, whether *here* or *hereafter*, no Man ever was, is, or will be *accepted*, but in and thro' the *grand Propitiation* made by the *Blood* of Chriſt. This I take to be the main Doctrine taught by our Lord in that Chapter, which He delivers ſo earneſtly, and inculcates ſo ſtrongly, for the Glory of the Divine *Juſtice*, *Holineſs*, *Goodneſs*, *Philanthropy*; and for humbling the *Pride* of Sinners, apt to conceive highly of their *own worth*; as alſo for the convincing all Men, to whom the Goſpel ſhould be propounded, of the abſolute neceſſity of *cloſing* in with it, and *living* up to

in memoria, quod pro nobis *caro* ejus *crucifixa* & *vulnerata* ſit. *Auguſtin.* de Doctrin. Chriſtian. l. III. c. 16. p. 52. Tom. III. Bened.

it.

it. That *general* Doctrine of *Salvation by Chriſt alone*, by *Chriſt crucified*, is the great and important Doctrine, the Burden of Both Teſtaments; ſignified in all the Sacrifices and Services of the old Law, and fully declared in every Page almoſt of the New Teſtament. What Doctrine more likely to have been intended in *John* the VI*th*, if the Words will bear it; or if over and above, the *univerſality* of the Expreſſions appears to require it? *Eating* and *drinking*, by a very eaſy, common Figure, mean *receiving*[c]: And what is the Thing to be *received*? Chriſt Himſelf in his whole Perſon: *I am the Bread of Life*[d].——*He that eateth me, even He ſhall live by me*[e]. But more particularly, He is to be conſidered as giving his *Body* to be broken, and as ſhedding his *Blood* for making an Atonement; and ſo the *Fruits of his Death* are what we are to *receive* as our Spiritual Food: His *Fleſh is Meat indeed*, and his *Blood is Drink indeed*[f]. His *Paſſion* is our *Redemption*, and by his *Death* we *live*. This Meat is adminiſtred to us by the *Hand* of *God*; while by the *Hand* of *Faith*, ordinarily, we take it, and in the uſe of the *Sacraments*[g]. But

CHAP. V.

c So *eating* and *drinking* Damnation (1 Cor. XI. 29.) is *receiving* Damnation.

d *John* VI. 35. 48. 51.

e *John* VI. 57. f *John* VI. 55.

g *Sacramenta* ſunt Media offerentia & exhibentia *ex parte Dei*: Fides Medium recipiens & apprehendens ex *parte noſtra*: Quemadmodum igitur *manus donans*, & *manus recipiens* non ſunt oppoſita ſed relata, & ſubordinata, ita quoque *Sacramenta* & *Fides* non ſunt ſibi invicem opponenda. *Gerhard.* loc. Comm. Par. IV. p. 309.

God

CHAP. VI.

God may *extraordinarily* adminiſter the ſame Meat, that is, may *apply* the ſame *Benefits* of Chriſt's Death, and *Virtue* of his Atonement, to Subjects *capable*, without any Act of theirs; as to *Infants*, *Idiots*, &c. who are merely *paſſive* in receiving it, but at the ſame Time offer no *Obſtacle* to it.

THE XXVIII*th* Article of our Church ſays, that *The Means whereby the Body of Chriſt is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.* That Sacrament is ſuppoſed to be given to none but *Adults*; and to them, not only *Faith* in general, but a *true* and *right* Faith, and the ſame *working by Love*, is indiſpenſably requiſite, as an *ordinary* Mean[h]. All which is conſonant to what I have here aſſerted, and makes no Alteration as to the Expoſition of *John* VI. which ſpeaks not principally of what is required in Adult Chriſtians, or of what is requiſite to a *worthy* Reception of the *Holy Communion*, but of what is *abſolutely* neceſſary at all Times, and to all Perſons, and in all Circumſtances, to a *happy Reſurrection*; namely, an Intereſt in, or a Participation of the *Atonement* made by Chriſt upon the Croſs. He that is taken in, as a *ſharer* in it, is *ſaved:* He that is *excluded* from it, is *loſt*.

SOME learned Writers having obſerv'd that our Lord in that Chapter, attributes much to a Man's *believing* in Him, or *coming to Him*, as

h Ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μεταχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ διδασκόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν —— καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. *Juſt. Mart.* Apol. 1. p. 96.

the means to *everlaſting Life*, have conceived, that *Faith*, or *Doctrine*, is what He preciſely meant by the *Bread* of *Life*, and that *believing* in Chriſt is the ſame with the *eating* and *drinking* there ſpoken of. But the *Thing* to be received, is very diſtinct from the *Hand* receiving; therefore *Faith* is not the *Meat*, but the *Mean*. Belief in Chriſt is the *Condition* requir'd, the *Duty* commanded: But the *Bread of Life* is the *Reward* conſequent. Believing is not *eating* or *drinking* the Fruits of Chriſt's Paſſion, but is *preparatory* to it, as the *Means* to the *End*[i]. In ſhort, Faith, ordinarily, is the *Qualification*, or one Qualification; but the Body and Blood is the *Gift* it ſelf, and the *real Inheritance*. The *Doctrine* of Chriſt, lodged in the *Soul*, is what gives the Soul its proper temperature and fitneſs to receive the Heavenly Food: But the Heavenly Food is *Chriſt Himſelf*, as once *crucified*, who has ſince been *glorified*. See this Argument very clearly and excellently made out at large, by a late learned Writer[k]. It may be true, that *eating* and *drinking* Wiſdom, is the ſame with *receiving* Wiſdom: And it is no leſs true, that *eating* and *drinking* Fleſh and Blood, is *receiving* Fleſh and Blood; for eating means re-

CHAP. VI.

i *Credere* in Chriſtum, & *edere* Chriſtum, vel carnem ejus, inter ſe tanquam *prius* & *poſterius* differunt; ſicuti ad Chriſtum *venire*, & Chriſtum *bibere*. Præcedit enim *acceſſus* & *Apprehenſio*, quam ſequitur *Potio*, & *manducatio:* Ergo *Fide* Chriſtum prius recipimus, ut *habitet* ipſe in nobis, fiamuſque ipſius vivæ Carnis & Sanguinis *participes*, adeoque unum cum ipſo———Itaque, notione definitioneque aliud eſt *Spiritualis manducatio* quam *credere* in Chriſtum. *Lamb. Danæus* Apolog. pro Helvet. Eccleſ. p. 23.

k *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 393. &c.

ceiving.

CHAP. V.

ceiving. But where does *Fleſh*, or *Blood* ſtand for *Wiſdom*, or for *Doctrine?* What Rules of *Symbolical* Language are there, that require it; or can ever admit of it? There lies the ſtreſs of the whole Thing. *Fleſh*, in Symbolical Language, may ſignify *Riches*, *Goods*, *Poſſeſſions*[l]: and *Blood* may ſignify *Life:* But Scripture never uſes either as a *Symbol* of *Doctrine*. To conclude then, eating Wiſdom, is receiving *Wiſdom*; but eating Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood is receiving *Life* and *Happineſs* thro' his Blood, and in one Word, receiving *Him*; and that not merely as the Object of our *Faith*, but as the Fountain of our *Salvation*, and our *ſovereign Good*, by means of his Death and Paſſion.

To confirm what has been ſaid, let us take in a noted Text of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, which appears deciſive in this Caſe. *We have an Altar, whereof They have no right to eat which ſerve the Tabernacle*[m]. Whether the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of Spiritual eating *in the Sacrament*, or *out of the Sacrament*, is not now the Queſtion: But that He ſpeaks of *Spiritual eating*, cannot reaſonably be doubted. And what can the *eating* there mean, but the *partaking* of Chriſt *crucified*, participating of the Benefits of his *Paſſion?* That is the proper *Chriſtian* eating, ſuch as none but *Chriſtians* have a clear and covenanted Right to. The Apoſtle ſpeaks

l See *Lancaſter*'s Symbolical Dictionary, prefixed to his Abridgment of *Daubuz*. p. 45.

m *Hebr.* XIII. 10. Compare *Rev.* VI. 9. *Zornius* Opuſc. Saer. Tom. 2. p. 542.

not in that Chapter, of eating *Doctrine*, but of eating *Sacrifice*. The References there made to the *Jewiſh Sacrifices*, plainly ſhew, that the Apoſtle there thought not of eating the *Doctrine* of the Croſs, but of eating, that is, partaking of, the *Sacrifice* or *Atonement* of the Croſs [n]. Therefore, let this be taken in, as an additional Explication of the *eating* mentioned in *John* VI, ſo far at leaſt as to ſhew that it muſt refer to ſome *Sacrifice*, and not to mere *Doctrines*. CHAP. VI.

I AM aware that many Interpreters of good Note among the Ancients [o], as well as many learned Moderns, have underſtood *Altar* in that Text, directly of the *Lord's Table*, and the *eating*, of *oral* Manducation: Which Conſtruction would make the Text leſs ſuitable to my preſent Purpoſe. But other Interpreters [p], of good Note alſo, have underſtood the *Altar* there mentioned of the Altar in Heaven, or of the Altar of the *Croſs* (both which reſolve at length into one) and ſome have defended that Conſtruction with great Appearance of Reaſon.

n Mihi perſpicuum videtur eſſe, *Aram* hic poni pro *victima* in Ara deo oblata. Senſus verborum hic eſt, ut puto: Jeſu Chriſti qui vera eſt pro peccatis Hominum victima, nemo fieri particeps poteſt, qui in ceremoniis & externis ritibus *Judaicis*, Religionis Arcem cenſet eſſe poſitam. *Moſhem.* ad *Cudworth*, p. 3.

o *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, *Primaſius*, *Sedulius*, *Haymo*, *Remigius*, *Anſelm.* Plerique tam veteres quam recentiores ſignificari volunt menſam Dominicam. *Eſtius* in loc.

p *Chryſoſtom* in Hebr. Hom. XI. p. 807. *Cyrill. Alex.* de Adorat. L. IX. 310. Compare *Lightfoot*, opp. Tom. II. Part. 2. p. 1259.——1264. *Outram.* de Sacrif. p. 332, &c. *Wolfius*, Cur. Crit. in loc.

CHAP. VI.

Eſtius, in particular, after *Aquinas* and others, has very ingenuouſly and rationally maintained it, referring alſo to *John* VI. 51. as parallel, or ſimilar to it, and underſtanding Both of *Spiritual* eating, abſtracted from *Sacramental*[q]. In this Conſtruction I acquieſce, as moſt natural and moſt agreeable to the whole Context: Neither am I ſenſible of any juſt Objection that can be made to it. The Apoſtle did not mean, that They who ſerved the Tabernacle, *had no Right to believe in Chriſt*; That indeed would be harſh: But He meant that They who ſerved the Tabernacle, *not believing* in Chriſt, or however ſtill *adhering* too tenaciouſly to the *Legal* Oblations, had no Right or Title to *partake* of the *Sacrifice* or *Atonement* made by Chriſt. The Thought is ſomewhat ſimilar to what the ſame Apoſtle has elſewhere ſignified; namely, that They who affected to be *juſtified* by the *Law*, forfeited all Benefit ariſing from the *Grace* of the Goſpel, and *Chriſt* could *profit* them nothing[r].

BUT for the clearer Perception of *Spiritual* Feeding, and for the preventing *Confuſion* of Ideas, it will be proper to diſtinguiſh between what it is *primarily*, and what *ſecondarily*; or between the *Thing* itſelf, and the *Effects*, *Fruits*, or *Conſequences of it*. 1. Spiritual Feeding, in

q Huc etiam pertinet, quod Corpus Chriſti, in cruce oblatum, Panis vocatur, Fide manducandus. Ut *Joann.* VI. *Panis* inquit, *quem ego dabo, caro mea eſt, quam ego dabo pro mundi vita*: Scilicet, in Cruce. *Eſtius* in loc. Compare Bp. *Moreton* on the Sacrament, B. VI. Ch. 3. p. 416.

r *Gal.* V. 2, 3, 4.

this Caſe, directly and primarily means no more than the eating and drinking our Lord's Body *broken*, and Blood *ſhed*; that is, partaking of the *Atonement* made by his *Death* and *Sufferings*: This is the prime Thing, the Ground and Baſis of all the reſt. We muſt firſt be *reconciled* to God by the *Death* of his *Son*, before we can have a juſt Claim or Title to any Thing beſides [f]: Therefore, the Foundation of all our Spiritual Privileges is our *having* a *Part* in that *Reconcilement*; which, in ſtrictneſs, is *eating* and *drinking* his Fleſh and Blood in St. *John*'s Phraſe, and *eating* of the *Altar* in St. *Paul*'s. 2. The Reſult, Fruit, or Effect of our thus eating his *crucified* Body, is a Right to be Fellow-Heirs with his Body *glorified:* For, if we are made Partakers of his *Death*, we ſhall be alſo of his *Reſurrection* [t]. On this is founded our *myſtical Union* with Chriſt's *glorified* Body, which neither ſuppoſes nor infers any *local* Preſence: For all the *Members* of Chriſt, however *diſtant* in Place, are thus myſtically *united* with Chriſt, and with each other. And it is well known, that *Right* or *Property*, in any Poſſeſſion, is altogether independent of *local* Preſence, and may as eaſily be conceived without it, as with it [u]. 3. Upon CHAP. VI.

f *Coloſſ.* I. 20, 21, 22. *Epheſ.* II. 13, 16.

t *Rom.* V. 9, 10, 11. *Phil.* III. 10, 11. *Rom.* VI. 5.—8.

u Pro tanta conjunctione aſſerenda inter nos & Chriſtum, non opus *præſentia corporali* aut *ſubſtantiali* Corporis Chriſti, quam ſtatuere multi conantur in Euchariſtia. Nam eâ nil plus vel commodi vel utilitatis habebimus quam ſi Chriſtum quoad *corpus* ſuo loco ſinamus in Cœlis. Videmus enim *Chriſtianos* poſſe eſſe *invicem membra*, & quidem *conjunctiſſima*, tametſi Aliquis eorum degat in *Britannia*, Alius in *Gallia*, & Alius in *Hiſpania*. Quod ſi de

CHAP. VI.

on ſuch *myſtical Union* with the *Body* of Chriſt *glorified*, and making ſtill part of his whole *Perſon*, follows a gracious vital *Preſence* of his *Divine* Nature, abiding in us, and *dwelling* with us [w]. Upon the ſame follows the like gracious vital *Preſence*, and *Indwelling* of the other two *Divine* Perſons [x]: And hereupon follow all the *Spiritual Graces*, wherewith the true Members of Chriſt are inriched.

THIS orderly ranging of Ideas may contribute very much towards the clearing our preſent Subject of the many Perplexities with which it has been embarraſſed; and may further ſerve to ſhew us, where the Ancients, or Moderns have happened to exceed, either in Sentiment or Expreſſion, and how far they have done ſo, and how they were led into it. The *Ancients*, in their Account of *Spiritual Feeding*, have often paſſed over the direct and immediate feeding upon Chriſt conſidered as *crucified*, and have *gone* on to what is properly the Reſult or Conſequence of it, namely, to the *myſtical Union* with the Body *glorified*, and what hangs thereupon. There

ſi de *Membris* ipſis conceditur, cur de *Capite* idem fateri erit abſurdum, ut hac *Spirituali* conjunctione ſimul poſſit in *cælis* eſſe, ac *ſpiritualiter* nobiſcum *conjungi*? Quod idem in *Matrimonio* uſu venire intelligimus, ubi Sancta Scriptura prædicat, virum & uxorem *unam carnem* eſſe: Quod non minus verum fateri coguntur Adverſarii cum una conjuges habitant, quam ſi *locorum intervallo* nonnunquam disjungantur. *Pet. Martyr.* in 1 Cor. XII. 12, 13. fol. 178. conf. *Albertin.* de Euchariſt, p. 230, 231.

w *John* VI. 56. *John* XV. 4. *Matt.* XXVIII. 20. XVIII. 20.

x *John* XIV. 16, 17, 23. 1 *Cor.* III. 16. VI. 19. 2 *Cor.* VI. 16.

was

was no Fault in ſo doing, more than what lies in too quick a *Tranſition*, or too confuſed a blending of Ideas. CHAP. VI.

I AM aware that much Diſpute has been raiſed, by contending Parties, about the Senſe of the *Ancients* with Reſpect to *John* VI. It may be a tedious Enquiry to go through: For, there is no doing it to the Satisfaction of conſidering Men, without taking every Father, one by one, and re-examining his Sentiments, as they lie ſcattered in ſeveral Places of his Writings, and that with ſome Care and Accuracy. It may be of ſome Uſe to go over that Matter again, after many others, if the Reader can but bear with a little *Prolixity*, which will be here unavoidable. There have been two *Extremes* in the Accounts given of the *Fathers*, and both of them owing, as I conceive, to a Neglect of proper *Diſtinctions*. They who judge that the Fathers in general, or almoſt univerſally, do interpret *John* VI. of the *Euchariſt*, appear not to diſtinguiſh between *interpreting*, and *applying*: It was right to *apply* the *general* Doctrine of *John* VI. to the particular Caſe of the Euchariſt, conſidered as *worthily* received; becauſe the *Spiritual Feeding* there mentioned, is the *Thing ſignified* in the Euchariſt, yea and *performed* likewiſe. After we have ſufficiently proved, from other Scriptures, that in and by the Euchariſt, ordinarily, ſuch *Spiritual Food* is conveyed, it is then right to *apply* all that our Lord, by St. *John*, ſays in the *general*, to that *particular* Caſe: And this indeed

CHAP. VI.

deed the *Fathers* commonly did. But such *Application* does not amount to *interpreting* that Chapter of the Euchariſt. For Example; the Words, *except ye eat the Fleſh of Chriſt*, &c. *you have no Life in you*, do not mean directly, that *you have no Life without the Euchariſt*, but that you have no Life without *participating of our Lord's Paſſion:* Nevertheleſs, ſince the Euchariſt is one Way of *participating of the Paſſion*, and a very conſiderable one, it was very pertinent and proper to urge the Doctrine of that Chapter, both for the clearer Underſtanding the *beneficial* Nature of the Euchariſt, and for the exciting Chriſtians to a frequent and devout Reception of it. Such was the Uſe which ſome early Fathers made of *John* VI. (as our Church alſo does at this Day, and that very juſtly) though I will not ſay, that ſome of the later Fathers did not extend it farther: As we ſhall ſee in due Place.

As to thoſe who, in another Extreme, charge the Fathers in general as interpreting *John* the VI*th* of *digeſting Doctrines* only, they are more widely miſtaken than the former, for want of conſidering the *Tropological* Way of commenting then in Uſe: Which was not properly *interpreting*, nor ſo intended [y], but was the more frequently made uſe of in this Subject, when there was a *mixed* Audience; becauſe it was a Rule not to divulge their *Myſteries* before incompetent Hearers, before the

y See my *Importance*, p. 438, 510, &c. And *Preface* to Scripture Vindicated, p. 17, 18.

uninitiated,

uninitiated, that is the *unbaptized*. But let us now take the *Fathers* in their Order, and conſider their real Sentiments, ſo far as we can ſee into them, with Reſpect to *John* VI. CHAP. VI.

Ignatius never formally cites *John* VI: But He has been thought to favour the *Sacramental* Interpretation, becauſe He believed the Euchariſt to be a Pledge, or *Means, of an happy Reſurrection:* For it is ſuggeſted, that He could learn that Doctrine only from *John* the VI*th* [z]. But this appears to be puſhing a Point too far, and reaſoning inconſequently. *Ignatius* might very eaſily have maintained his Point, from the very Words of the *Inſtitution*, to as many as knew any Thing of *Symbolical* Language: For, what can any one infer leſs from the being Symbolically *fed* with Chriſt's *Body crucified*, but that it gives a Title to an Inheritance with the Body *glorified?* Or, if the ſame *Ignatius* interpreted 1 *Cor.* X. 16. (as He ſeems to have done) of a *myſtical* Union with the *Blood* of Chriſt [a], then He had *Scripture-ground* ſufficient, without *John* VI, for making the Euchariſt a *Pledge* or *Means* of an happy Reſurrection. *John* the VI*th* may be of excellent Uſe to us for explaining the *beneficial* Nature of the Euchariſt, *Spiritual Manducation* being preſuppoſed as the *Thing ſignified* in that Sacrament: But it will

z See *Johnſon.* Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 387, 388.

a Ἓν πολήριον, εἰς ἕνωσιν τῦ αἵματος αὐτῦ. *Ignat.* ad Philad. §. IV. p. 27. Compare *Chryſoſtom* on 1 *Cor.* X. 16. who interprets *Communion* there mentioned by ἕνωσις. αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ ἄρτου τύτου ἐνώμεθα.

CHAP. VI.

not be prudent to leſſen the real *Force* of other conſiderable Texts, only for the Sake of reſting all upon *John* VI. which at length cannot be proved to belong directly, or primarily to the *Euchariſt.*

IT ſeems that *Ignatius* had *John* VI. in his Eye, or ſome Phraſes of it, in a very noted Paſſage, where He had no Thought of the *Euchariſt*, but of eating the *Bread of Life*, after a more excellent Way, in a State of Glory. The Paſſage is this: "I am alive at this Writing, but "my Deſire is to die. My Love is crucified, "and I have no ſecular *Fire* left: But there "is in me living *Water*, ſpeaking to me with-"in, and ſaying, *Come to the Father.* I delight "not in corruptible Food, nor in the Enter-"tainments of this World. The *Bread of God* "is what I covet; *Heavenly Bread, Bread of* "*Life*, namely, the *Fleſh* of Chriſt Jeſus, the "Son of God, who in theſe laſt Times became "the Son of *David*, and of *Abraham:* And I "am athirſt for the *Drink of God*, namely his "*Blood*, which is a Feaſt of Love that faileth "not, and Life everlaſting. I have no Deſire "to live any longer among Men; neither ſhall "I, if you will but conſent [b].

b Ζῶν γὰρ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἐρῶν τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν· ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται· καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόὕλον· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον· δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· οὐκ ἥδομαι τροφῇ φθορᾶς, οὐδὲ ἡδοναῖς τοῦ βίου τούτου· ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω, ἄρτον οὐράνιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς, ὅς ἐστιν σὰρξ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῦ υἱῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ γενομένου ἐν ὑστέρῳ εἰς σπέρμα Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ πόμα θεοῦ θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος, καὶ ἀέναος ζωή. Οὐκ ἔτι θέλω κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ζῆν· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται, ἐὰν ὑμεῖς θελήσητε. *Ignat.* ad Roman. c. 7, 8.

HERE we may take Notice of *Heavenly Bread*, *Bread of God*, *Bread of Life*, our Lord's own Phraſes in *John* VI. And *Ignatius* underſtands them of Spiritual Food, of feeding upon the *Fleſh* of Chriſt, the *Son of God*, incarnate. *Drink of God*, He interprets in like Manner, of the *Blood* of Chriſt; which is the nobleſt *Feaſt*, and *Life eternal*. Learned Men have diſputed, whether He intended what He ſaid, of *Sacramental* Food, or of *Celeſtial*; whether of enjoying Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*, or in *Heaven*. To me it appears a clear Point, that He thought not of *communicating*, but of *dying*: And the *Euchariſt* was not the Thing which He ſo earneſtly begged to have (for, who would refuſe it?) but *Martyrdom*, which the Chriſtians might endeavour to protract, out of an over-officious Care for a Life ſo precarious. However, if the Reader is deſirous of ſeeing what has been pleaded on the Side of the *Euchariſt*, He may conſult the Authors referred to at the Bottom [c], and may compare what others have pleaded on the contrary Side [d]. I ſee no impropriety in *Ignatius*'s feeding on the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of Chriſt in a State of Glory [e], ſince the

CHAP. VI.

c *Smith.* Not. in *Ignat.* p. 101, 102.
Grabe Spicileg. Tom. II. p. 229.
Johnſon. Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 387. alias 392.

d *Caſaubon*, Exercit. XVI. num. 39.
Albertinus, de Euchariſt, L. II. c. 1. p. 286.
Halloixius, vit. Ignat. p. 410.
Ittigius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. ſæc. 2. p. 169, 170.

e A learned Writer objects that the *eating of Chriſt's Fleſh in another World, is a way of Expreſſion ſomewhat unaccountable.*
Johnſon. Unbloody Sacr. Part I. p. 389. alias 394.

Figure

CHAP. VI.

Figure is eaſily underſtood, and is made uſe of by others[f] beſides *Ignatius*. Our Enjoyment in a World to come is intirely founded in the *Merits* of Chriſt's *Paſſion*: And our Lord's *Interceſſion* for us (as I have above hinted) ſtands on the ſame Bottom. Our Spiritual Food, both above and below, is the Enjoyment of the ſame Chriſt, the *Lamb ſlain*. The *future Feaſt* upon the *Fruits* of his Atonement, is but the Continuation and Completion of the *preſent*. Only, here it is under *Symbols*, there it will be without them: Here it is remote, and imperfect, there it will be proximate and perfect.

IT has been ſtrongly averred, that *Irenæus* underſtood *John* VI. of the *Euchariſt*; though He never directly quotes it, nor ever plainly refers to it: But it is argued, that *by the Euchariſtical Symbols* (according to *Irenæus*) *we have the Principle of a bleſſed Immortality convey'd to our Bodies, for which there is no Appearance of Proof in* Scripture, but in *John* VI: Therefore here is as clear Proof of his ſo interpreting that Chapter, as if He had *cited it at length*[g]. How inconcluſive this kind of Reaſoning is, and how injurious beſides to our main Cauſe, is viſible enough, and has been intimated before, in anſwer to the like Pretence concerning *Ignatius*. It appears the worſe with reſpect to *Irenæus*, becauſe He manifeſtly did found his Doctrine on 1 *Cor.* X. 16. and expreſsly quoted

f *Athanaſius* de Incarn. & contr. Arian. p. 883. *Damaſcen.* Tom I. p. 172. *Auguſtin.* Tom. V. p. 384.

g *Johnſon.* Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 387. alias 392.

it,

it, for that very Purpoſe [h]. He judged, as every ſenſible Man muſt, that if the *Euchariſt*, according to St. *Paul*, amounts to a *Communion*, or *Communication* of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood* to every faithful Receiver, that then ſuch Receiver, for the Time being, is therein conſidered as *Symbolically* fed with the *crucified* Body, and of Conſequence intituled to be Fellow-Heir with the Body *glorified* [i]. He draws the ſame Concluſion [k], tho' more obſcurely, from the Words of the Inſtitution, *This is my Body*, &c. And the Concluſion is certain, and irreſiſtible when the Words are rightly underſtood. Therefore let it not be thought, that we have *no Appearance of Proof*, where we have ſtrong Proof; neither let us endeavour to looſen an important Doctrine from its firm Pillars, whereon it may ſtand ſecure, only to reſt it upon weak Supports, which can bear no Weight.

HAD *Irenæus* been aware that *John* VI. was to be interpreted directly of the *Euchariſt*, ſtrange that He ſhould not quote That rather than the other, or however along with the other, when He had ſo fair an Occaſion for it. Stranger ſtill, that when He ſo frequently, and

h Vani autem omnimodo, qui ——— Carnis ſalutem negant, & Regenerationem ejus ſpernunt, dicentes, *non eam capacem eſſe Incorruptibilitatis*. Si autem non ſalvetur hæc, nec Dominus Sanguine ſuo redemit nos, neque *Calix Euchariſtiæ communicatio ſanguinis ejus eſt, neque Panis quem frangimus, communicatio corporis ejus eſt*. *Iren.* L. V. c. II. p. 293. Ed. Bened.

i See the Argument explained in a *Charge*, upon the Doctrinal Uſe of the Sacrament, p. 11, 12, 13, 14.

k *Irenæus*, L. IV. c. 18. p. 251. L. V. c. 2. p. 294.

ſo

CHAP. VI.

ſo fully ſpeaks his Mind concerning the *Euchariſt*, and with the greateſt Reverence imaginable, that He ſhould never think of *John* the VI*th* all the Time; that He ſhould never make any uſe at all of it for advancing the Honour of the *Sacrament*, had He ſuppoſed that it ſtrictly belonged to it, and was to be interpreted of it. The Silence of a Man ſo knowing in the Scriptures, and ſo devoutly diſpoſed towards this Holy Sacrament, is a ſtrong preſumptive Argument (were there nothing elſe) of his Underſtanding *John* VI. very differently from what Some have imagined.

THERE is one Place in *Irenæus*, which ſeems to carry ſome remote and obſcure Alluſion to *John* VI. The *Logos*, the *Divine Nature* of our Lord, according to Him, is the *perfect Bread of the Father*, and *Bread of Immortality*; and He talks of *eating* and *drinking* the ſame *Logos*, or *Word*[1]. If He had *John* VI. then in his Eye (which is not improbable) He interpreted it, we ſee, not of *Sacramental* Manducation, but of *Spiritual*; not of the *Signs*, but of the Things *ſignified*, apart from the *Signs*. Only, it is obſervable, that while He ſpeaks of our feeding upon the *Logos*, He explains it as done through the Medium of the *Fleſh*: It is the *Human* Nature, by which we are brought to feaſt upon the *Divine*. St. *Chryſoſtom* gives the like Con-

1 Ὁ ἄρτος ὁ τέλειος τοῦ πατρὸς ——— ὡς ὑπὸ μαθητοῦ τὴν σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ τραφέντες ——— ἐθισθέντες τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἄρτον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρός. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 38. p. 284.

ſtruction

ſtruction of *Bread of Life*, in *John* the VI*th*, interpreting it, ſo far, of our Lord's *Divine* Nature [m]. But I proceed. CHAP. VI.

OUR next ancient Writer is *Clemens of Alexandria*, who flouriſhed about A. D. 192. In the firſt Book of his *Pædagogue*, Chapter the 6*th*, He quotes ſeveral Verſes [n] of our Lord's Diſcourſe in St. *John*, commenting upon them after a dark, allegorical Way; ſo that it is not eaſy to learn how He underſtood the main Doctrine of that Chapter. I ſhall take Notice of ſome of the cleareſt Paſſages. After ſpeaking of the *Church* under the Figure or Similitude of an *Infant*, brought forth by Chriſt with *bodily Pain*, and *ſwadled* in his *Blood*, He proceeds thus: "The *Word* is all Things to the "Infant, a *Father*, a *Mother*, a *Preceptor*, a "*Foſter*: *Eat*, ſays He, *my Fleſh*, and *drink my* "*Blood*. Theſe are the proper Aliments which "our Lord adminiſters: He reaches out *Fleſh*, "and He pours out *Blood*; and nothing is want-"ing for the Growth of the Infants. O won-"derful Myſtery! He bids us lay aſide the old "carnal Corruption, together with the *anti-*"*quated* Food, and to partake of the *new Food* "of Chriſt, receiving *Him*, if poſſible, ſo as "to lay Him up within our ſelves, and to en-

m Καὶ πρῶτον περὶ τ̃ θεότητος αὐτοῦ διαλέγεσθαι, λέγων, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τ̃ ζωῆς. οὐδὲ γ̃ περὶ τ̃ σώματος τοῦτο εἴρηται. περὶ γ̃ ἐκείνου πρὸς τῷ πλῆ λέγει· καὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν. Αλλὰ πῶς περὶ τ̃ θεότητος. Καὶ γ̃ ἐκείνη διὰ τ̃ θεὸν λόγον ἄρτος ἐστίν. *Chryſoſt. in Joh.* Hom. 44. p. 264. Tom. VIII. Ed. Bened.

n *John* VI. 32, 33, 51, 53, 54, 55.

"cloſe

CHAP. VI.

" cloſe *our Saviour* in our *Breaſts* [o]. There is another Paſſage near akin to this, a few Pages higher, which runs thus :

" OUR Lord, in the Goſpel according to " St *John*, has otherwiſe introduced it under " *Symbols*, ſaying, *eat my Fleſh, and drink my* " *Blood*; allegorically ſignifying the clear Li- " quor of *Faith*, and of the *Promiſe*, by both " which the *Church*, like Man, compacted of " many Members, is watered and nouriſhed, " and is made up or compounded of Both; " of *Faith* as the *Body*, and of *Hope* as the *Soul*, " like as our Lord of *Fleſh* and *Blood* [p]. Theſe Hints appear to be very obſcure ones, capable of being turned or wreſted ſeveral Ways. Some therefore have appealed to theſe and the like Paſſages, to prove that *Clemens* underſtood *John* VI. of *Doctrines*, or *Spiritual Actions* [q]. Others have endeavoured ſo to explain them as to make them ſuit rather with the *Euchariſt* [r]. Perhaps Both may gueſs wide. In the firſt Paſſage, *Clemens* ſays nothing of receiving either *Doctrines*, or *Euchariſt*, but of receiving *Chriſt Himſelf:* In the Second, He does indeed ſpeak of receiving *Faith*, and the *Promiſe*; but then He owns it to be an *Allegorical*, or *Anagogical* View of the Text; from whence one may infer that He intended it not for the *primary*

o Ὁ λόγος τὰ πάντα τῷ νηπίῳ. κ. τ. λ. *Clem.* Pædag. l. 1. c. VI. p. 123. Ed. Oxon.

p Ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίῳ. κ. τ. λ. c. *Clem.* Ibid. p. 121.

q Dr. *Whitby*, Dr. *Claget*, *Baſnage* Annal. Tom. I. p. 320.

r *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 255, &c.

Senſe,

Senſe, or for ſtrict Interpretation. The Doctrine which *Clemens* moſt *clearly* expreſſes, and uniformly abides by, is, that *Chriſt Himſelf* is our Food and Nutriment [f]: And, particularly, by *ſhedding* his Blood for us [t]. CHAP. VI.

AT the End of *Clemens*, among the *Excerpta Theodoti*, there is a pretty remarkable Paſſage; which, tho' it belongs to a *Valentinian* Author, may be worth the taking Notice of [u]. Commenting on *John* VI. He interprets the *living Bread*, of the Perſon of Chriſt: But as to our Lord's ſaying v. 49. *The Bread which I will give is my Fleſh*, He propoſes a twofold Conſtruction. 1. He underſtands it of the *Bread* in the *Euchariſt*. 2. Correcting his firſt Thought, He interprets *Bread* to mean the *Church*; having, as I conceive, 1 *Cor.* X. 17. in his Eye; *We being many are one Bread, and one Body*. Of what Weight or Authority a *Valentinian* Gloſs ought to be in this Caſe, I pretend not to ſay: But This is the firſt *clear* Precedent we ſhall meet with in *Antiquity*, for interpreting any Part of *John* the VI*th* directly of the *Euchariſt*.

f Ὁ κύριος, ἡ τροφὴ τῶν νηπίων. *Clem.* ibid. p. 124. ἡ τροφὴ, τελείοις κύριος Ἰησοῦς. Ibid. ἡμῖν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ χριστὸς ἡ τροφὴ τοῖς νηπίοις. p. 125. ἄρτον αὐτὸν οὐρανῶν ὁμολογεῖ ὁ λόγος. Ibid. πολλαχῶς ἀλληγορεῖται ὁ λόγος, ᾗ βρῶμα, καὶ σὰρξ, καὶ τροφὴ, καὶ ἄρτος, καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα. p. 126.

t Τροφεὺς ἡμῶν λόγος, τὸ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐξέχεεν αἷμα, σώζων τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. *Clem.* Ibid. p. 124. Τὸ αὐτὸ ἄρα καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα τῷ κυρίου πάθους καὶ διδασκαλίας σύμβολον. p. 127.

u Ὁ ζῶν ἄρτος, ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δοθεὶς, ὁ υἱός ἐστι, τοῖς ἐσθίειν βουλομένοις. ὁ δὲ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, φησὶν, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν. ἤτοι ἡ τρέφεται ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ἢ ὅπερ καὶ μᾶλλον, ἡ σὰρξ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἄρτος οὐράνιος, συναγωγὴ εὐλογημένη. *Excerpt. Theod.* apud *Clem.* p. 971.

And

CHAP. VI.

And it is obſervable, that it was offered only in the *conjectural* Way, and another Interpretation preſently ſubjoined as *preferable* to it.

Tertullian quotes two Verſes out of *John* VI. And He interprets the *Bread* there mentioned, not of the *Sacramental* Bread, but of *Chriſt Himſelf*; not of the *Signs*, but of the Things *ſignified*. Preſently after, He quotes part of the Words of the Inſtitution, *This is my Body*, referring to the Euchariſt: And there He does not ſay that our Lord's Body is *That Bread* (as He had ſaid before, that Chriſt, or the *Logos* is our Bread) but that the Lord's Body is *underſtood*, or *conſidered* in Bread: As much as to ſay, the Euchariſtical Bread is *by Conſtruction* that natural Body of Chriſt, which is the true Bread. And for This He refers not to *John* VI. but to the Words of the *Inſtitution*. *Tertullian* here joined together the *Spiritual Food* mentioned in *John* VI. in the *abſtract* Way, and the ſame as conveyed in the *Euchariſt*; but He did not interpret *John* VI. of the Euchariſt [w].

IT has been ſuggeſted by ſome [x], that *Tertullian* underſtood *John* VI. merely of *Faith*, or *Doctrine*, or *Spiritual* Actions: And it is ſtre-

w *Panem noſtrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*, ſpiritualiter potius intelligamus: Chriſtus enim *panis* noſter eſt, quia *vita* Chriſtus, & *vita* Panis: *Ego ſum*, inquit, *Panis vitæ*. Joh. VI. 35. Et paulo ſupra: v. 33. *Panis eſt ſermo Dei vivi, qui deſcendit de cœlis*. Tum quod & corpus ejus in Pane cenſetur: *Hoc eſt corpus meum*. *Tertull.* de Orat. c. VI. p. 131.

x Dr. *Claget*, Dr. *Whitby*, &c. Compare *Baſnag.* Annal. Tom. I. p. 320.

nuouſly

nuouſly denied by others[y]. The Paſſage upon which the Diſpute turns, is Part of his Reply to *Marcion*; who took a Handle from the Words, *The Fleſh profiteth nothing*, to argue againſt the Reſurrection of the Body. CHAP. VI.

" THO' He ſays, *The Fleſh profiteth nothing*, " yet the Senſe is to be governed by the Sub- " ject-Matter. For, becauſe They thought it " an *hard* and intolerable *Saying*, as if He had " intended, *really* to give them his *Fleſh* to *eat*; " therefore in order to reſolve the Affair of " Salvation into *the Spirit*, He premiſed that " *it is the Spirit that quickeneth*, and then ſub- " joined, that *the Fleſh profiteth nothing*; name- " ly, towards quickening. He ſhews alſo what " He would have them underſtand by *Spirit*: " The *Words that I ſpeak unto you, they are Spi-* " *rit, and they are Life*, conformable to what " He had ſaid before; *He that heareth my* " *Words, and believeth in Him that ſent me, hath* " *everlaſting Life*, &c.—Therefore as he makes " *the Word* the *Quickner*, becauſe *the Word* is " Spirit, and *Life*, He calls the ſame his *Fleſh*, " inaſmuch as *The Word was made Fleſh*; which " conſequently is to be hungred after for the " Sake of Life, and to be *devoured* by the Ear, " and to be *chewed* by the Underſtanding, " and *digeſted* by Faith: For, a little before " alſo He had pronounced the Heavenly Bread " to be his Fleſh, *&c*[z].

ALL

y *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part 1. p. 358, &c.

z Etſi *Carnem* ait *nihil prodeſſe*, ex materia dicti dirigendus eſt ſenſus. Nam quia durum & intolerabilem exiſtimaverunt Sermo-

CHAP. VI.

ALL that one can juſtly gather from this confuſed Paſſage is, that *Tertullian* interpreted the *Bread* of *Life* in *John* VI. of *the Word*; which He ſometimes makes to be *vocal*, and ſometimes *ſubſtantial*, blending the Ideas in a very perplexed Manner: So that He is no *clear* Authority for conſtruing *John* VI. of *Doctrines* &c. All that is certain is, that He ſuppoſes the *Word made Fleſh*, the *Word incarnate* to be the *Heavenly Bread* ſpoken of in that Chapter.

THERE is another Place in *Tertullian*[a], where by *Fleſh* and *Bread* in *John* VI. He very plainly underſtands, not the *ſacramental*, but *natural* Body of Chriſt, not *Doctrine* but literally *Fleſh*; as indeed our Lord evidently meant it. For, as to Verſes 53, 54, *&c.* the Figure is not in the Word *Fleſh*, but in the Words *Eating* and *Drinking*, as learned Men have very juſtly

nem ejus, quaſi vere carnem ſuam illis edendam determinaſſet; ut in *Spiritum* diſponeret ſtatum ſalutis, præmiſit, *Spiritus eſt qui vivificat:* Atque ita ſubjunxit *Caro nihil prodeſt*; ad vivificandum ſcilicet. Exequitur etiam quid velit intelligi *Spiritum: Verba quæ locutus ſum vobis, Spiritus ſunt, Vita ſunt.* Sicut & ſupra, *Qui audit ſermones meos, & credit in eum qui me miſit, habet vitam æternam, & in judicium non veniet, ſed tranſiet de morte in vitam.* Itaque *Sermonem* conſtituens vivificatorem, quia *Spiritus & Vita* Sermo, eundem etiam *Carnem* ſuam dixit, quia & *Sermo Caro erat factus:* Proinde in cauſam vitæ *appetendus*, & *devorandus* auditu, & *ruminandus* Intellectu, & Fide *digerendus*; nam & paulo ante, Carnem ſuam panem quoque cœleſtem pronuntiarat, &c. *Tertull.* de Reſurr. Carn. c. XXXVII. p. 347.

a *Panis quem ego dedero pro ſalute mundi, caro mea eſt.* Quod ſi *una Caro*, & *una Anima*, illa triſtis uſque ad mortem, & illa *Panis* pro mundi ſalute; ſalvus eſt numerus duarum ſubſtantiarum, in ſuo genere diſtantium, excludens carneæ Animæ unicam ſpeciem. De Carn. Chriſti. c. 13. p. 319.

obſerved.

obſerved [b]. But then this is to be ſo underſtood that the *eating* and *drinking* the natural Body and Blood amount to *receiving the Fruits* of the Blood ſhed, and Body ſlain; otherwiſe there is a *Figure* in the Words *Body* and *Blood*, as put for the *Fruits* of them, if *eating* amounts ſimply to *receiving*. But I paſs on.

MUCH Diſpute has been [c] about *Origen*'s Conſtruction, or Conſtructions (for He has more than one) of *John* VI. The Paſſages produced in the Debate are ſo many, and the Pleadings here and there ſo diffuſe, that it would be tedious to attend every Particular. I ſhall endeavour to ſelect a few critical Places, from whence one may competently judge of his Sentiments upon the whole Thing.

Origen's general Obſervation relating to that Chapter, is, that it muſt not be *literally*, but *figuratively* underſtood [d]. He commonly underſtands the *living Bread* of the Divine *Logos*, as the true Nutriment of the Soul [e], The *Logos*, but

b Figura autem non eſt in *carne*, vera enim Chriſti caro ad vitam eſt manducanda: Supereſt igitur ut ſit in *manducandi* vocabulo, quod a *corporis* Organis, ad Facultates *Animæ* figurate tranſferatur. *Albertinus*, p. 525. *Caro & Sanguis* nihil aliud deſignant quam quod verba præ ſe ferunt, ac proinde nec ænigma, nec Parabola ſunt ——— At id nullo modo evincit vocabulum *manducandi* non eſſe *metaphoricum*, aut manducationem illam de *Manducatione ſpirituali* non eſſe intelligendum. Ibid. 526.

c See *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 360. — 373.

d Si Secundum *Literam* ſequaris hoc ipſum quod dictum eſt, *niſi manducaveritis Carnem meam, & biberitis Sanguinem meum*, occidit hæc litera. *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. VII. p. 225. Ed. Bened.

e *Ego ſum panis vivus*, &c. Qui hæc dicebat *Verbum* erat, quo Animæ paſcuntur. ——— Intuearis quomodo juſtus ſem-

CHAP. VI.

but conſidered as incarnate [f]. At other Times, He allegorizes the *Fleſh* of Chriſt in a very harſh Manner, making it a Name for high myſterious *Doctrines* [g]. All that He ſhould have ſaid, and probably all that He really meant was, that the Mind is prepared and fitted for enjoying the *Fruits* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, the Benefits of his *Paſſion*, by thoſe divine Truths, thoſe Heavenly Contemplations. He ſhould have diſtinguiſhed the *Qualifications* for receiving, from the *Thing* to be received. *Believing* in Chriſt, is not *enjoying* Him, but it is in order to it: And the *Doctrine* of the Atonement is not the *Atonement* itſelf, whereon we are to *feed*. But I return to our Author.

IN another Place, He obſerves, that the *Blood* of Chriſt may be drank, not only in the Uſe of the *Sacraments*, but by *receiving* his *Words*; and He interprets the *drinking* his *Blood* to mean, the embracing his *Doctrines* [h]. Here again

per & ſine Intermiſſione *manducet de pane vivo*, & repleat *Animam ſuam*, ac ſatiet eam *cibo cæleſti*, qui eſt *verbum* Dei et Sapientia ejus. *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. XVI. p. 266. Ed. Bened.

f Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἀληθὴς βρῶσις, σὰρξ Χριστοῦ, ἥτις λόγος οὖσα, γέγονε σὰρξ· καλὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. *Origen.* περὶ εὐχ. p. 244.

g Ubi enim *myſticus* ſermo, ubi dogmaticus et *Trinitatis fidei* repletus profertur et ſolidus, ubi *futuri ſæculi*, amoto velamine Literæ, legis ſpiritualis Sacramenta panduntur, ubi *ſpes Animæ*, &c. ——— Hæc omnia *carnes* ſunt *verbi* Dei, quibus qui poteſt perfecto intellectu *veſci*, et corde purificato, ille verè Feſtivitatis Paſchæ immolat Sacrificium, et diem feſtum agit cum Deo et Angelis ejus. *Origen.* Homil. in Num. XXIII. p. 359, 360.

h *Bibere* autem dicimur *Sanguinem* Chriſti, non ſolum *Sacramentorum* ritu, ſed et cum *ſermones* ejus recipimus, in quibus vita conſiſtit,

again He miſtakes the *Means* for the *End*, the *Qualification* for the *Enjoyment*, the *Duty* for the *Bleſſing*, or *Reward*, juſt as He did before. However, He is right in judging, that the *Sacraments* are not the *only Means*, or Inſtruments, in and by which God *confers* his *Graces*, or *applies* the *Atonement*, though they are the moſt conſiderable. CHAP. VI.

IT ſhould be noted, that *Origen*, in the Paſſage laſt cited, was commenting upon *Numb.* XXIII. 24. *Drink the Blood of the ſlain:* And He had a mind to *allegorize* it, as his Way was, into ſomething *Evangelical.* So he thought firſt of the *Blood of Chriſt*; and could He have reſted there, He need not have looked beyond the Benefits of the grand Sacrifice: But it happened, that *Slain* was in the *Plural*, and ſo to make his *Allegory* hit, He was neceſſitated to take in *more* than *one*; therefore He pitched upon the *Apoſtles* to join with Chriſt, as *ſlain* for Chriſt. The next Thing was to interpret *Blood* in ſuch a Senſe as might equally fit both Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and ſo He interpreted it to mean *Doctrines:* And now the *Blood of the Slain* turns out, at length, *Doctrines of the Slain*, and the Allegory becomes complete [i]. I thought

conſiſtit, ſicut et ipſe dicit: *Verba quæ locutus ſum, Spiritus & Vita eſt.* Eſt ergo ipſe vulneratus, cujus nos *Sanguinem bibimus*, id eſt, *doctrinæ* ejus *verba* ſuſcipimus, *Origen.* in Num. Hom. XVI. p. 334. Conf. Hom. VII. in Levit. p. 225.

i Sed et illi nihilominùs *vulnerati* ſunt, qui nobis verbum ejus prædicarunt. Ipſorum enim, id eſt, *Apoſtolorum* ejus *verba* cum legimus, et vitam ex eis conſequimur, *vulneratorum Sanguinem bibimus.* Orig. Ibid.

CHAP. VI.

it proper thus briefly to hint how *Origen* fell into that odd Conſtruction, becauſe He may be looked upon, in a Manner, as the Father of it: Whatever Weight the admired *Origen* may juſtly have as to other Caſes, He can have but little in This, where He manifeſtly trifled.

I SHALL cite but one Paſſage more from Him; a very remarkable one, and worth the noting. After having ſpoken of the outward *Sign* of the Euchariſt, He goes on thus: "So "much for the *Typical* and *Symbolical* Body. "But I might alſo have many Things to ſay "of the *Logos* Himſelf, who became *Fleſh* and "*true Food*, and of which whoſoever eats, He "ſhall live for ever, no wicked Man being "capable of eating it. For were it poſſible "for an ill Man, as ſuch, to feed upon Him "who was made Fleſh, the *Logos*, and the "*living Bread*, it would not have been written "that *whoſoever eateth of this Bread, ſhall live* "*for ever*[k]. Here we may obſerve, that *Origen* interprets the *true Food*, and *living Bread*, not of *Doctrines*, nor of the *Sacramental* Bread (the *typical, ſymbolical* Body) but of *Chriſt Himſelf*, of the *Word made Fleſh:* And as to the *eating* that true Food, He underſtands it of a

k Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ, καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος· πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σὰρξ, καὶ ἀληθὴς βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν. εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μὲν ὄντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον ὄντα, καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. *Orig.* in Matt. p. 254. Ed. Huet.

vital

vital Union with the *Logos*, a Spiritual Participation of Chriſt. This is a juſt Conſtruction of *John* VI. and falls in with That which I have recommended in this Chapter. A learned Writer, who had taken uncommon Pains to ſhew that the *Fathers* interpreted *John* VI. of the *Euchariſt*, was aware that this Paſſage of *Origen* was far from favouring his Hypotheſis, and therefore frankly declared that He *could not pretend to underſtand it*[1]; obſerving however, that it could not at all favour another Opinion, eſpouſed by Dr. *Whitby* and others; meaning the *Doctrinal* Interpretation. The Truth is, that it favours neither, but directly overthrows Both: And had that very ingenious and learned Author been aware of any *middle* Opinion, which would ſtand clear of the Difficulties of both *Extremes*, it is more than probable that He would have cloſed in with it.

CHAP. VI.

Cyprian, who was but a few Years later than *Origen*, comes next to be conſidered. The moſt obſervable Paſſage, ſo far as concerns our preſent Purpoſe, occurs in his *Expoſition* of the Lord's Prayer: I have thrown it to the Bottom of the Page[m], for the learned Reader to judge of

1 *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 373.

m *Panis vitæ Chriſtus eſt:* Et panis Hic omnium non eſt, ſed *noſter* eſt———*Chriſtus* eorum qui corpus ejus contingunt, *Panis* eſt. Hunc autem *Panem* dari nobis quotidie poſtulamus, ne qui in Chriſto ſumus, & Euchariſtiam quotidie ad *Cibum Salutis* accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abſtenti & non communicantes a *Cæleſti Pane* prohibemur, a Chriſti Corpore ſeparemur, ipſo prædicante & monente: *Ego ſum Panis vi-*

CHAP. VI.

of, and may here ſave my ſelf the Trouble of tranſlating it. But I ſhall offer a few Remarks upon it. 1. *Cyprian*, in this Paſſage, does not interpret *Bread of Life* of the Euchariſtical Bread, but of *Chriſt Himſelf*[n], thrice over. 2. He ſeems to give the Name of *Lord's Body* in the Euchariſt to the *Sacramental Bread*, as repreſentative and exhibitive of the natural Body. 3. But then a Communicant muſt receive *worthily*, muſt receive *jure communicationis*, under a *juſt Right* to Communion, otherwiſe it is nothing. 4. Therefore it concerns every one to preſerve to Himſelf that Right by ſuitable Behaviour, and not to incur any juſt Forfeiture, by Miſbehaviour. 5. For, if He incurs juſt Cenſure, and is juſtly debarred from Communion, He is ſhut out from Chriſt. Such is the Form and Proceſs of *Cyprian*'s Reaſoning: And it muſt be owned that *John* VI. is very pertinently alledged by Him, in order to convince every ſerious Chriſtian of the Neceſſity of his continuing in a State *fit* for the *Reception* of the *Holy Communion*, and not ſuch as ſhall diſqualify Him for

tæ, qui de cœlo deſcendi: Si quis ederit de meo Pane, vivet in æternum. Panis autem quem ego dedero, Caro mea eſt pro ſæculi vita. Quando ergo dicit in æternum vivere ſi quis ederit de *ejus Pane*, ut manifeſtum eſt eos vivere qui *Corpus ejus* attingunt & Euchariſtiam *jure communicationis* accipiunt, ita contra tenendum eſt & orandum, ne dum quis abſtentus ſeparatur a *Chriſti Corpore*, procul remaneat a ſalute, comminante Ipſo & dicente: *Niſi ederitis Carnem Filii Hominis & biberitis ſanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Et ideo *Panem noſtrum*, id eſt, *Chriſtum*, dari nobis quotidie petimus, ut qui in Chriſto manemus & vivimus, a Sanctificatione ejus & *Corpore* non recedamus. *Cypr.* de Orat. Domin. p. 209, 210. Ed. Bened. Alias 146, 147.

n Compare *Albertinus*, p. 377, 378.

it.

it. For, ſince our Lord there lays ſo great a Streſs upon *eating* his *Fleſh*, and *drinking* his *Blood*; and ſince communicating *worthily* is *one way* of doing it; and ſince, if we are rendred morally unfit for That, we muſt of Courſe be morally unfit for *all other ways*, and ſo totally debarred from *feeding* upon *Chriſt* at all, from Life and Happineſs: Theſe Things conſidered, it is very obvious to perceive, that *John* VI. tho' not particularly pointing to the *Euchariſt*, is yet reductively applicable to it, in the way of Argumentation, and is of very great Force for the exciting Chriſtians to a reverential Regard for it, and to a ſolicitous Care that they may never, by any Fault of theirs, be debarred from it. In ſhort, though *John* VI. doth not directly ſpeak of the Euchariſt, yet Chriſtians in the due Uſe of that Sacrament, do That which is there mentioned, do really *eat* his *Fleſh* and drink his *Blood*, in the *Spiritual* Senſe there intended: Therefore *Cyprian* had good Reaſon to quote part of that Chapter, and to *apply* the ſame as *pertinent* to the *Euchariſt*, in the way of juſt Inference from it, upon known Chriſtian Principles. CHAP. VI.

Cyprian elſewhere quotes *John* VI. 53. [*except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*] in order to inforce the Neceſſity of *Baptiſm* [o]. Either,

o Ad Regnum Dei niſi baptizatus & renatus fuerit pervenire non poſſe. In Evangelio cata Johannem. *Niſi quis renatus fuerit*, &c. item illic: *Niſi ederitis Carnem Filii Hominis & biberitis Sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Cyprian. Teſtimon. L. III. c. 25. p. 314.

He

CHAP. VI.

He thought that the *Spiritual Feeding*, mentioned in St. *John*, was common both to *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt*, and might be indifferently obtained in either Sacrament: Or elſe the Turn of his Thought was this, that as there is *no Life* without the Euchariſt, and as Baptiſm muſt *go before* the Euchariſt, Baptiſm muſt of Courſe be neceſſary in order to come at the Kingdom of God. If this laſt was *Cyprian*'s Thought, then indeed He interpreted *John* VI. directly of the Euchariſt: But I incline to underſtand Him according to the other View firſt mentioned; and the rather becauſe we ſhall find the ſame confirmed by the African *Fulgentius*, in his Turn.

Novatian of the ſame Age appears to underſtand *John* VI. of *Spiritual* Manducation at large, feeding upon a *right Faith* (which of Courſe muſt take in Faith in the Merits of Chriſt's Paſſion) and *Conſcience undefiled*, and an *Innocency of Soul*. He refers to *John* VI. 27. and immediately after adds, that *Righteouſneſs* and *Continence*, and the other *Virtues* are the *Worſhip* which God requires: He had before intimated that They were the *true*, the *holy*, and the *clean* Food [p]. But I preſume, all this was

p Cibus, inquam, *verus*, & *ſanctus*, & *mundus* eſt *Fides Recta, immaculata conſcientia*, & *innocens Anima*. Quiſquis ſic paſcitur, Chriſto conveſcitur: Talis epulator conviva eſt Dei; iſtæ ſunt epulæ quæ *Angelos* paſcunt; iſtæ ſunt menſæ quæ *Martyres* faciunt. ——— Hinc illa Chriſti ——— *operamini autem non eſcam quæ perit, ſed eſcam permanentem in vitam æternam, quam Filius Hominis vobis dabit; hunc enim Pater ſignavit Deus.* Juſtitiâ, inquam, & continentiâ, & reliquis Deus virtutibus colitur. *Novat.* de Cib. Judaic. c. 5. p. 140. Edit. Welchm.

to

to be ſo underſtood, as not to exclude the ſalutary Virtue of *Chriſt*'s *Atonement*: Only, the Subject He was then upon, led Him not to ſpeak plainly of it. In another Work He underſtands *Chriſt Himſelf* to be the *Bread of Life*, and makes it an Argument of his *Divinity* [q], referring to *John* VI. 51. So that if we take the Author's *whole* Senſe on this Head; *Chriſt*, or the *Fruits* of his *Death*, together with our own *Faith* and *Virtues*, are our *Bread* of *Life*, our Spiritual Food, as taught in *John* VI. CHAP. VI.

WE may now come down to the Fourth Century, where we ſhall meet with *Euſebius*, a Writer of conſiderable Note. His common way is, to interpret the *Bread of Life*, or *Heavenly Bread* of Chriſt Himſelf, of the Heavenly *Logos* become incarnate [r]. He underſtands *John* VI. of *Spiritual* eating, and intimates that *Judas* received the *Bread from Heaven*, the *Nutriment* of the *Soul*: Not meaning what he ſaid, of *Judas*' receiving the *Sacramental* Bread in the *Euchariſt*; but, I conceive, his Meaning was, that *Judas* had been bleſſed with *Heavenly Inſtructions*, and *Divine Graces* tho' He made an ill Uſe of them. He had *taſted* of the *Heavenly Gift*, of the bleſſed Influences of the *Divine Logos*, but fell away notwithſtanding [f].

Euſebius,

q Si Homo tantummodo Chriſtus, quomodo refert, *ego ſum Panis vitæ æternæ*, &c. —— cum neque *Panis vitæ* Homo eſſe poſſit, ipſe mortalis, &c. *Novat.* de Trin. c. XIV. p. 46. conf. c. XVI. p. 54.

r *Euſebius* in Pſalm. p. 81. 267, 471. In *Iſa.* p. 586.

f Συνίησιν ὃ ἂν τῷ διδασκάλῳ, οὐ τὸν κοινὸν ἄρτον αὐτῷ μόνον συνίστῃσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς θρεπτικοῦ μεταλαμβάνειν ἠξιοῦτο· περὶ οὗ ἔλεγεν

CHAP. VI.

Euſebius, in another Place, interprets Fleſh and Blood in *John* VI. of our Lord's *myſtical Body and Blood*, as oppoſed to *natural*[t]. And when He comes afterwards to explain this *myſtical* Body and Blood, He interprets the ſame of *Words* and *Doctrines*[u], grounding his Expoſition on *John* VI. 63. *The Words that I ſpeak*, &c. A learned Author[w] endeavours to make *Euſebius* contradict Himſelf in the ſame Chapter: But He is *conſiſtent* ſo far, which will evidently appear to any one that reads Him with Attention. However, I think his Interpretation of *John* VI, to be forced, and wide. It was very odd to make *Doctrines* the *myſtical Body and Blood*, and to ſay, that the *Doctrines*, or *Words* then ſpoken, were what our Lord intended afterwards to *give for the Life of the World:* Such Conſtruction appears altogether harſh and unnatural. Beſides, ſince *Euſebius* interpreted *Bread of Life* of our Lord's *Divine* Nature, He ought certainly to have underſtood that *Bread* which our Lord was to *give*, to be the *Human Nature*, the *natural* Body and Blood. But my Buſineſs here is not ſo much to *diſpute*, as to *report:* And it is plain enough, that *Euſebius* followed *Origen* in this Matter, and that

ἔλεγεν ὁ σωτὴρ· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ὢν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. *Euſeb.* in Pſalm. p. 171.

t Οὐ περὶ ἧς ἀνείληφε σαρκὸς διελέγετο, περὶ δὲ τοῦ μυστικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος. *Euſeb.* Eccleſ. Theol. contr. Marcell. p. 179.

u Ὥστε αὐτὰ εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα, ὧν ὁ μετέχων αἰεὶ, ὡσανεὶ ἄρτῳ οὐρανίῳ τρεφόμενος, τὸ οὐράνιον μεθέξει ζωῆς. *Euſeb.* ibid. p. 180.

w *Johnſon.* Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 373, 374.

both

both of them favoured the ſame *myſtical* or *allegorical* Conſtruction; whether conſtantly and uniformly, I need not ſay. CHAP. VI.

Athanaſius was contemporary with *Euſebius*, as a young Man with one grown into Years. He occaſionally gives us his Thoughts upon *John* VI. 61, 62, 63. in theſe Words: "Here "He has made mention of Both as meeting "in Himſelf, both *Fleſh*, and *Spirit*; and He "has diſtinguiſhed the *Spirit* from the *Fleſh*, "that They believing not only the *viſible* Part "of Him, but the *inviſible* alſo, might learn "that his Diſcourſe was not *carnal*, but *Spi-*"*ritual*. For, how many Men muſt the Body "have ſufficed for Food, if it were to have fed "all the World? But for that very Reaſon "He intimated beforehand the Son of Man's "Aſcenſion into Heaven, to draw them off "from corporeal Imaginations, and to teach "them that the Fleſh which He had been "ſpeaking of, was to be *Heavenly Meat* from "above, and *Spiritual Food*, which He would "give them: *For*, ſays He, The Words which "I have ſpoken, they are *Spirit*, and *Life*. As "much as to ſay, That which outwardly *ap-*"*pears*, and is to be given for the Salvation "of the World, is This *Fleſh* which I bear a-"bout me: But This with the *Blood* thereof, "ſhall be by me *Spiritually* given for Food, "*Spiritually* diſpenſed to every one, for a "Preſervative unto all, to ſecure to them a Re-"ſurrection to Life eternal [x]. Thus far He.

[x] *Athanaſ.* Epiſt. IV. ad Serapion, p. 710. Ed. Bened.

The

CHAP. VI.

The Obſervations which I have hereupon to offer, are as follow. 1. Our Author very juſtly conſtrues the *Fleſh* which Chriſt was to give, of his *natural* Body; and ſuppoſes no *Figure* in the Word *Fleſh*. 2. He as rightly ſuppoſes ſome *Figure* to lie in the Words, *given for Meat*, which He would have to be *Spiritually* underſtood. 3. The *Spiritual*, or hidden Meaning, according to our Author, is, that the *Fleſh* is joyned with *Spirit*, the *Humanity* with the *Divinity*, and therefore in the giving his *Fleſh* to *eat*, He at the ſame Time imparts his *Divinity* with the happy Influences of it. 4. The *Fleſh*, or Human Nature, being all that was ſeen, we ought to raiſe our Minds up to the *Divinity* united to it, and veiled under it; and ſo may we *Spiritually* feaſt upon it, and be ſealed to a happy Reſurrection by it.

SUCH is *Athanaſius*'s Comment upon *John* VI. worthy of Himſelf, and (like moſt other Things of his) neat, clear, and judicious. Here is not one Word of the *Euchariſt*: Neither do I ſee any certain Grounds to perſuade us, that He had it in his Mind; tho' I am ſenſible that the Generality of the Learned do conceive that He had [y]. The Thought appears juſter, and finer [z], without that Suppoſition, than

y The Reader may compare, if He pleaſes, *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, (Part I. p. 167, 374.) which interprets *Athanaſius* of the *Euchariſt*. However, it is very certain. that this Paſſage is no way favourable to Thoſe who would conſtrue *John* VI. of *Precepts*, or *Doctrines*.

z He ſeems to expreſs the ſame Thought, where, without any View to the *Euchariſt*, He ſays: As our Lord, by putting on a Body

than with it, ſo that there is no Neceſſity at all for it. He could hardly underſtand *Fleſh* of Chriſt's *natural* Fleſh, and ſtill imagine it to be given in the Euchariſt, unleſs he had added, *virtually*, conſtructionally, or in *Effect* which He does not: His Conſtruction of *Spiritual* is, that our Lord's Divine *Spirit* goes along with that *natural* Fleſh to make it ſalutary Food to us. Beſides, to interpret our Lord's giving his Fleſh *for the Life of the World*, of his giving it Symbolically in the *Euchariſt* (rather than *really* on the *Croſs*) is too low, and too jejune a Senſe to be fathered upon a Perſon of his great Diſcernment. Add to this, that He ſpeaks expreſsly of *Spiritual* Manducation, not of *oral*, or *corporal*, and therefore cannot be underſtood to interpret *John* VI. of *Sacramental* eating and drinking [a]. My Perſuaſion therefore is, that the Paſſage relates not at all to the *Euchariſt*, but to our Lord's becoming *Man* in order to bring us up to *God*; or, in ſhort, to his taking our *Humanity*, and making an *Atonement* for us, in order to *feaſt* us with his *Divinity*, and ſo to *raiſe* us up to Himſelf. In another Place, *Athanaſius* diſtinguiſhes the *Bread* which *is Chriſt*, from the CHAP. VI.

Body was made Man, ſo are we Men made *divine* by the *Logos*, being *aſſumed* thro' his Fleſh, and ſo of Conſequence Heirs to Eternal Life. Ὡς γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ σῶμα, γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος· οὕτως ἡμεῖς καὶ ἄνθρωποι παρὰ τοῦ λόγου πε θεοποιούμεθα, ἀφθαρτοποιούμενοι διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ λοιπὸν ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομοῦμεν. *Athanaſ.* Orat. III. p. 584. conf. *Sermo Major.* in nov. Collect. p. 6, 7. de *Incarnat.* contra Arian. p. 874, 876.

a Vid. *Chamier.* de Euchariſt. L. XI. c. 5. p. 613.

CHAP. VI.

Bread which *Chriſt gives* (referring to *John* VI.) and He reſolves the latter into the *Fleſh* of our Lord, but as operating in virtue of the *Holy Spirit*. He obſerves, that we receive that *Heavenly Bread* here, as the *firſt Fruits* of what we are to receive hereafter, inaſmuch as we receive the *Fleſh of Chriſt*, which is a *quickning Spirit* [b]. He had before ſuppoſed that Chriſt had inſinuated the Union of the *Logos* with his *Humanity*, and now here He ſuppoſes, that a *Conjunction* of the *Spirit* is inſinuated likewiſe; ſince the *Logos* and the *Spirit* are inſeparable. But nothing is here ſaid directly of the *Euchariſt*; ſo that it cannot be hence certainly inferred that *Athanaſius* interpreted *John* VI. of the *Euchariſt*, or that He ſo much as *applied* it that way: His Thoughts, in both theſe Paſſages, ſeem to have been intent upon quite another Thing. A learned Man, to make this laſt Paſſage look the more favourable to his *Scheme*, renders part of it thus: *We have the firſt Fruits of the future Repaſt in this preſent Life, in the Communion of the Body of our Lord* [c]: Where the whole Force of the Plea lies in the Phraſe *Communion of the Lord's Body*, and the Idea which it is apt to convey to an En-

b Ὅπ πάλιν ὁ κύριος λέγῃ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς. ἀλλαχοῦ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καλεῖ ἄρτον οὐράνιον, λέγων. Τ ἄρτον ἡμῶν Τ ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· ἐδίδαξε γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι αἰτεῖν Τ ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, τουτέστι Τ μέλλοντα, οὗ ἀπαρχὴν ἔχομεν ἐν τῇ νῦν ζωῇ, τ σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου μεταλαμβάνοντες, καθὼς αὐτὸς εἶπε· ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν ὑπὲρ τ τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. πνεῦμα γὰρ ζωοποιοῦν ἡ σάρξ ἐστι τοῦ κυρίου ——— *Athan.* de Incarn. p. 883.

c *Johnſon.* Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 375.

gliſh Reader. Let but the Place be rendred literally, *partaking of the Fleſh of the Lord*[d], and the Idea vaniſhes. It is certain, that *Fleſh* there means *natural* Fleſh, not *Sacramental*, or *Symbolical*; becauſe it is the *firſt Fruits* of the *future Repaſt*, (which will be *real*, not *Sacramental*) and means, according to our Author, partaking of the *Holy Spirit*. Therefore, one would wonder how any attentive Reader ſhould conceive, that *Athanaſius* here ſpeaks *directly* and *poſitively*, or at all, of *oral* Manducation. That He ſpeaks of *Spiritual* Manducation is ſelf-evident: And He might mean it of Spiritual Manducation *at large*; for He ſays nothing of the *Euchariſt* in particular, to confine it to that *ſingle* Form, or Inſtance of it. CHAP. VI.

Cyril of *Jeruſalem*, in his Catechetical Lectures to the *uninitiated*, interprets *John* VI. 64. of *good Doctrine*[e]. But in what He ſays to the *initiated*, He *applies John* VI. 54. to the Euchariſt[f]. To reconcile both Places, or both Conſtructions, we may fairly preſume, that He ſuppoſed our Saviour in Verſe the 64*th*, to in-

d It is a Thought which *Athanaſius* dwells much upon, that Chriſt took our Fleſh upon Him, to make Himſelf *One* with us; and that we are *Partakers* of Him, by being Partakers of the *ſame Fleſh*. Orat. III. p. 571, 572, 573. 582, 583, 588. *Sermo Major*. p. 7. *de Incarn.* contr. Arian. p. 875.

e Περὶ ἧς ἡ καλῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος λέγει· τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι, καὶ ζωή ἐστιν· ἀντὶ τοῦ πνευματικά ἐστι. —— Τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστιν· ἵνα μὴ λαλιὰν χιλέων τοῦτο εἶναι νομίσῃς, ἀλλὰ τὴν καλὴν διδασκαλίαν. *Cyrill. Hieroſol.* Catech. XVI. §. 13, 14. p. 250, 251.

f *Cyrill. Hieroſol.* Catech. XXII. Myſtagog. IV. c. 4. p. 520, 521.

CHAP. VI.

timate, that what He had ſaid was, in the general, true and ſublime Doctrine, but withal *Spiritual*; and in Verſe the 54*th*, to intimate, that his *Fleſh* and *Blood* were to be *Spiritually* fed upon by the *Faithful*. Thus both Parts are conſiſtent: For, this Doctrine of *Spiritual* Manducation, was Spiritual Doctrine. And *Cyril* here *applies* that very Doctrine to the Caſe of the *Euchariſt*, becauſe He had ground ſufficient, from other Scriptures, to conclude, that ſuch *Spiritual* Manducation was a Privilege of That Sacrament, tho' not of That only. So He did not directly *interpret John* the VI*th*. of the *Euchariſt*, but He ſo *applied* it, and that very properly.

Hilary, of that Time, undertaking to prove that we are *one with Chriſt* by a *cloſer* Union than bare *Will* and *Conſent* amount to, draws an Argument from the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* (as He does likewiſe in the ſame Place from the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*) to prove a *real*, and *permanent*, but Spiritual Union between Chriſt and his *true* Members. The Thread of his Argument is this: In and by the Euchariſtical Food, we ſpiritually receive the *Word incarnate*, and are *myſtically* united with the *natural* Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, our Bodies with his Body: And we are thereby truly and ſubſtantially (therefore not in conſent only) united with Chriſt[g]. To confirm the

g Si enim verè verbum caro factum eſt, & vere nos verbum carnem *Cibo Dominico* ſumimus; quomodo non *naturaliter* manere in nobis exiſtimandus eſt &c.——vere, ſub *myſter.o*, carnem

the *reality* of ſuch Union, He appeals to *John* VI. 55, 56. *My Fleſh is Meat indeed——He that eateth my Fleſh——dwelleth in me, and I in Him.* It is obſervable, that He diſtinguiſhes the *Euchariſtical Food* from the *Food* mentioned in *John* VI: For *in* or *by* the *former*, we receive the *latter*, according to Him. Therefore He does not interpret *John* VI. of the *Euchariſt:* But, taking it for an acknowledged Principle, that by the *due* uſe of *one*, we come at the *other*, He pertinently *accommodates* or *applies* the Doctrine of *John* VI to the Euchariſt. In a word, *Hilary* does not teach that the Euchariſt is that *Fleſh* and *Blood* of Chriſt mention'd in *John* VI, but that the *Fleſh* and *Blood* there mention'd is receiv'd in, or by the Euchariſt, is *Spiritually* or *Myſtically* received; *ſub myſterio*, as He expreſſes it[h].

CHAP. VI.

Baſil ſays, "It is good and profitable to communicate daily of the ſacred Body and Blood "of Chriſt, ſince He Himſelf plainly ſays; *He "that eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, "hath eternal Life*[i]. He argues juſtly, becauſe the

carnem Corporis ſui ſumimus. *Hilar.* de Trin. L. VIII. Sect. 13. p. 954. conf *Chryſoſt.* in Johan. Hom. 46. p. 272, 273. Bened. *Cyrill. Alex.* de Trin. Dial. 1. p. 407. And compare my late *Charge* p. 20, 21.

h Ipſe enim ait, *caro mea vere eſt eſca* &c.——Ipſius Domini profeſſione, & Fide noſtra, vere caro eſt, & vere Sanguis eſt: Et hæc accepta atque hauſta id efficiunt, ut & nos in Chriſto, & Chriſtus in nobis ſit. Ibid. §. 14. p. 956. If any one wants to ſee the whole Argument clear'd and vindicated, againſt ſuch as hold the *corporal Preſence*, He may conſult *Albertine* p. 411. &c. or Bp. *Moreton* p. 358.——374. or *Chamier.* p. 648. &c.

i Τὸ κοινωνεῖν δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν, καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμόν· αὐτὸς σαφῶς λέγοντος.

CHAP. VI.

the Conſideration drawn from *John* VI, is, and ought to be of great Force: Not that *John* VI ſpeaks of the *outward Sacrament*, but of *Spiritual* Manducation at large, and of *inward Grace*; which, as we learn from other Scriptures, does ordinarily (where there is no impediment) go along with the Sacrament. *Baſil* therefore does not *interpret John* VI of the *Sacrament*, but He *applies* the general Doctrine there taught to one particular Inſtance whereunto it ordinarily belongs: Elſewhere He interprets it of *Spiritual* (not *oral*) Manducation of the Fleſh of Chriſt [k].

Gregory Nyſſen is ſometimes cited [l], as one that interprets *John* VI of the *Euchariſt*; but upon ſlender Preſumptions, without any Proof. *Macarius* alſo is made another Voucher [m], and with little or no Colour for it. *Ambroſe* is a Third [n]: And yet neither does He ſpeak home to the Point, as every careful Reader may ſoon ſee. I paſs them over for the ſake of Brevity.

λέγοντος. ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. *Baſil.* Epiſt. 289.

k *Baſil.* in *Pſalm.* XXXIII. 8.

l *Johnſon.* Unbloody Sacrifice. p. 385. It is argued, that *Greg. Nyſſen* muſt have underſtood *John* VI. of the Euchariſt, becauſe He made it a *Pledge* of the *Reſurrection*; which is no Argument at all, as was obſerved under *Ignatius* and *Irenæus*.

m *Johnſon*, p. 385. Vid. *Macar.* Orat. IV. p. 22.

N. B. *Macarius* may as reaſonably be thought to interpret *John* IV. 14 of the Euchariſt, as *John* VI. in that Place. It is abſurd to imagine that He ſo interpreted either; unleſs He ſuppoſed *Moſes* (whom He there mentions) to have received the *Euchariſt*.

n *Johnſon.* ibid. *Ambroſe* there plainly diſtinguiſhes the *Sacramental* Bread, from the Bread mention'd in *John* VI.

Jerome interprets the *Heavenly Bread*, of *Chriſt Himſelf*, and calls it *Angels Food*; intimating thereby that it is eaten in *Heaven*, but plainly teaching that it was eaten by the *Patriarchs* of old, and is now eaten, not only in the *Euchariſt*, but in the Sacrament alſo of *Baptiſm* [o]. From all which it is evident, that He interpreted *John* VI. of *Spiritual Feeding* at large. It is a Miſtake to imagine [p], that He meant *Sacramental Bread* and *Wine*, where He ſpeaks of the *Wheat* of which the *Heavenly Bread* is made, and of the *Wine* which is Chriſt's *Blood* [q]. All He intended was, that the *Wheat* and the *Wine*, mention'd in the Prophecy of *Iſaiah*, myſtically pointed to the *real* Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt; who is Himſelf that *Wheat* which makes the Heavenly Bread, according to his own Alluſion, where He reſembles Himſelf to *Wheat* falling, and bearing much Fruit [r].

CHAP. VI.

Chryſoſtom interprets *John* VI. 51. of Chriſt's

n Panis qui de Cœlo deſcendit corpus eſt Domini, & vinum quod diſcipulis dedit, Sanguis illius eſt Novi Teſtamenti &c.— Nec *Moyſes* dedit nobis *Panem verum*, ſed Dominus Jeſus: Ipſe conviva & convivium, ipſe comedens & quod comeditur.——— Hunc panem & *Jacob* Patriarcha comedere cupiebat, dicens, *Si fuerit Dominus mecum, & dederit mihi panem ad veſcendum* &c. —— Quotquot enim in Chriſto baptizamur, Chriſtum induimus, & *Panem comedimus Angelorum*, & audimus Dominum precantem, *meus cibus eſt, ut faciam* &c. *Hieronym. Hedibiæ.* Tom. IV. p. 171, 172. Ed. Bened.

p See *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. 376.

q Triticum quoque de quo *panis Cæleſtis* efficitur, illud eſt de quo loquitur Dominus, *Caro mea vere eſt cibus:* Rurſumque de vino, & *Sanguis meus vere eſt potus.* Hieron. in Iſa. c. 62. p. 462.

r. *John* XII. 24. Compare *Jerome* in *Oſe.* c. VII. p. 1285.

CHAP. VI.

natural Body, not of the *Sacramental*[s]. Elſewhere, diſtinguiſhing between the Bread which *is Chriſt*, and the Bread which *Chriſt gives*, He interprets the former of our Lord's *Divine Nature*[t]: Of the latter He offers a twofold Conſtruction, ſo as to comprehend both our Lord's own natural *Body*, and any ſalutary *Doctrines*, inaſmuch as *Both* of them ſtrengthen the Soul[u]. He takes notice that our Lord there ſpeaks of *Spiritual Food*[w], and that by the Euchariſtical Food we partake of the Spiritual, and become really *one* with Chriſt[x]. The Thought is the ſame with what we have ſeen in *Hilary* before cited: And it proves very evidently, that *Chryſoſtom* did not underſtand the Food ſpoken of in *John* VI, of the *Sacramental Food*, ſince He makes them as diſtinct as *Means* and *End*, or as the *inſtrumental* Cauſe and *principal*, while He ſuppoſes that by the due uſe of *one*, we come at the *other*. I ſhall not now give my ſelf the Trouble of particularly examining every Plea that has been offered,

s Ὑπὲρ πάντων τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέχεεν αἷμα, ὑπὲρ τούτων τὴν σφαγὴν κατεδέξατο, ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος, φησὶν, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστὶν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. *Chryſoſt.* de Anathemate Tom. I. p. 692. Ed. Bened. *conf.* Hom. 45. in Johann. p. 271.

t *Chryſoſtom* in Johan. Hom. 44. p. 264. cited above, p. 157. conf. Hom. 45. p. 270.

u Ἄρτον ὁ λόγος τὰ δόγματα λέγει ἐνταῦθα τὰ σωτήρια, καὶ τὴν πίστιν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν, ἢ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. ἀμφότερα γὰρ νεφροῖ τὴν ψυχήν. *Chryſoſt* in Joh. Hom. 45. p. 270.

w Μέμνηται τροφῆς πνευματικῆς. Ibid. p. 271.

x Μὴ μόνον κατὰ τὴν ἀγάπην γενώμεθα ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα, εἰς ἐκείνην ἀνακιρασθῶμεν τὴν σάρκα. διὰ τῆς τροφῆς γὰρ τοῦτο γίνεται, ἧς ἐχαρίσατο ——— Ibid. p. 272.

fered,

fered, or every Paſſage that has been alledged [y], to make *Chryſoſtom* appear favourable to another Hypotheſis. If the Reader does but bear in mind the proper *Diſtinction* between *interpreting* of the Euchariſt, and *applying* a Text, or Texts to the Euchariſt, He will need no further Solution. I ſhall only obſerve farther, that no one, of the later *Fathers*, has better expreſſed the true and full Meaning of our Lord in *John* the VI*th*, than *Cyril* of *Alexandria* has done, where He teaches, that " no Soul can " ever attain to Freedom from Sin, or eſcape " the Tyranny of Satan, or arrive to the City " above, *but by participating of Chriſt, and of* " *his Philanthropy*[z]; preſently after quoting *John* VI. 53. (together with *John* VIII. 34.) in proof of what He had ſaid.

CHAP. VI.

HITHERTO we have ſeen nothing in the *Fathers*, that can be juſtly thought *clear* and *determinate* in favour of *oral* Manducation, as directly and primarily intended in *John* VI. Many, or moſt of them have *applied* that general Doctrine of *Spiritual Feeding* to the particular Caſe of the Euchariſt, becauſe we are *Spiritually* fed therein: But they have not *interpreted* that Chapter directly of the *Euchariſt*, becauſe it has not one Word of the outward *Signs*, or *Symbols* of the Spiritual Food, but abſtracts from all, and reſts in the *general* Doctrine of the uſe and neceſſity of *Spiritual*

y See *Johnſon*. Unbl. Sacr. Part I. p. 384.

z Εἰ μὴ διὰ τ῀ χριϛοῦ μετοχῆς κ᾽ φιλανθρωπίας &c. *Cyrill. Alexander*. Glaph. in Exod. II. de Hoſt. Agni. p. 267.

CHAP. VI.

Nutriment, the Blood of Chriſt, in ſome Shape or other, to everlaſting Salvation. Thus ſtood the Caſe, both in the Greek and Latin Churches, for the firſt four Centuries, or ſomewhat more. But about the Beginning of the *Fifth* Century, aroſe ſome Confuſion. The frequent *applying* of *John* VI. to the Euchariſt, came at length to make many, among the *Latins* eſpecially, *interpret* it directly of the *Euchariſt:* And now Some thought *John* VI. 53. as deciſive a Text for the neceſſity of the *Euchariſt*, as *John* III. 5. was for the neceſſity of *Baptiſm.* Hereupon enſued a common Practice of giving the Communion to mere *Infants.* Pope *Innocent* I. is believed to have been the firſt, or principal Man that brought up ſuch Doctrine of the *neceſſity* of communicating Infants[a]: He was made Biſhop of *Rome* A. D. 402. It appears very probable, that from the Time of his Synodical Epiſtle A. D. 417, the Doctrine generally ran, in the *Latin* Churches at leaſt, that *unleſs you receive the Euchariſt, you have no Life in you.* St. *Auſtin* is ſuppoſed to have conſtrued the Text in that way, eſpecially from the Time of Pope *Innocent*[b]. But in ſome Places

a See *Wall*'s Hiſt. of Infant Baptiſm Part II. Ch. 9. p. 441. &c. 3*d* Edit. *Defence* p. 36. 384. *Bingham.* B. XV. c. 4. §. 7. Compare Mr. *Pierce*'s Eſſay on Infant Communion, who carries it much higher than others, upon Suggeſtions which bear a plauſible Appearance, and are worth examining by ſome Perſon of Learning, and Leiſure. But in the mean while, I acquieſce in Dr. *Wall*'s Account, as one that was well conſidered, and which, in my Opinion, cannot be far from the Truth.

b See *Wall.* ibid. p. 441, 442, 443. *Voſſius.* Hiſtor. Pelag. L. II. Part 3. p. 167. But *Thorndike* diſputes it. [*Epilog.* p. 176. &c. *De jure ſiniend.* p. 285.] with ſome ſhew of Reaſon.

of

of his Works, He interprets that Chapter, or ſome Parts of it, with clearer and better Judgment. Particularly, in his *Doctrina Chriſtiana*, L. III. c. 16. quoted above[c]: And alſo in another Work of his, where He plainly diſtinguiſhes the *Sacrament* of *Chriſt's Body* from the *Spiritual Food* mentioned in *John* VI[d]. There are two noted Paſſages of his, where He ſeems to interpret the *Living Bread* of eating *Doctrine*, of *believing* only[e]: But He only *ſeems* to do ſo, when He really does not. For He intends no more than this, that *Faith* is the *Mean* whereby we receive that *living Bread*; it is the *Qualification* requiſite for the Reception of it[f]. A Man muſt have had *Faith* to be *healed*, as we often read in the Goſpels; and *healing* certainly followed upon the *Faith* of the Perſon: And it might be right to ſay, *believe*, and thou

CHAP. VI.

c See above, p. 139.

d Panis quotidianus aut pro *iis omnibus* dictus eſt quæ hujus vitæ neceſſitatem ſuſtentant, aut pro *Sacramento Corporis Chriſti* quod quotidie accipimus, aut pro *Spirituali cibo* de quo idem Dominus dicit, *Ego ſum Panis*, &c. ——— *Auguſtin.* de Sermon. Domini in Monte, L. II. c. 7. conf. *de Civit. Dei*, L. XXI. c. 25.

e Ut quid paras dentes, & ventrem? *Crede*, & *manducaſti*. Credere enim in eum, hoc eſt manducare panem vivum. *Auguſtin.* in Johan. Tract. 25, 26. *Auguſtinus* hunc cibum *tripliciter* interpretatur: Videlicet de *propria Domini carne*, —— interdum etiam de *Sacramento carnis* hujus; nonnunquam de *Societate Fidelium*. Albertin. p. 691, 699.

f Non perſpexit ———ab *Auguſtino* ipſo, his verbis, Fidem ut *cauſam*, Manducationem vero ipſam Spiritualem ut *effectum* inter ſe conferri & collocari. Alioqui, ſi *credere*, & *manducare* una & eadem res eſſet ex *Auguſtini* mente, quid hac oratione fuerit ineptius? *Crede* & *manducaſti*, id eſt, *manduca* & *manducaſti*. Lamb. *Danæi* Apolog. pro Helvet. Eccl. p. 1477. opuſc. Ed. Genev. Conf. *Calvin.* Inſtitut. L. IV. c. 17. p. 280.

art

CHAP. VI.

art *healed:* But yet *Faith* and the *Cure* following were not the ſame Thing, but very diſtinct, both in Nature and Notion [g].

IT may be proper to go on to *Fulgentius* of the next Age, A. D. 507. a great Admirer and Follower of St. *Auſtin*, to ſee how this Matter ſtood among the *Africans* in his Time. He had a Queſtion put to Him, upon a Scruple raiſed from *John* VI. 53. concerning the Caſe of ſuch as having been *baptized*, happened to be prevented by Death from receiving the *Holy Communion:* And He determined that They were *ſafe*, becauſe *Baptiſm* exhibits the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt to faithful Recipients, as well as the *Euchariſt* [h]. He ſtrengthens his Determination of the Caſe, by the Authority of St. *Auſtin*, in a long Citation from him: And at length concludes, that receiving *Baptiſm*, is receiving the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, becauſe it is receiving the *Thing ſignified* in the other Sacrament [i]. He certainly judged very right:

g Compare *Johnſon*. Unbl. Sacr. Part I. p. 377.

h In ipſo Lavacro Sanctæ Regenerationis hoc fieri providebit. Quid enim agitur Sacramento Sancti Baptiſmatis, niſi ut credentes *Membra* Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti fiant, & ad compagem Corporis ejus eccleſiaſtica unitate pertineant. —— Tunc incipit unuſquiſque *particeps eſſe* illius unius *panis*, quando cœperit memorem eſſe, illius unius Corporis, &c.

i Unumquemque Fidelium *Corporis Sanguiniſque* Dominici *participem* fieri, quando in Baptiſmate membrum Corporis Chriſti efficitur nec alienari ab illo *panis caliciſve conſortio*, etiamſi antequam panem illum comedat, & calicem bibat, de hoc ſæculo in unitate Corporis Chriſti conſtitutus abſcedat. *Sacramenti* quippe *illius* participatione & Beneficio non privatur, quando ipſe hoc quod illud Sacramentum *ſignificat* invenitur. *Fulgent.* ibid. p. 227, 228. conf. *Cyrill. Alexandr.* Glaphyr. in Exod. L. II. p. 270. in Johann. IX. 6. p. 602.

And

And it is an Inſtance to ſhew, how plain good Senſe *over-ruled*, tho' it did not aboliſh, a wrong Interpretation of *John* VI, and removed, in ſome Meaſure, the uneaſy Scruples ariſing naturally from the then prevailing Conſtruction. The proper Inference from *Fulgentius*'s wiſe and wary Reſolution of the Caſe, is, that *John* VI. ought not to be rigorouſly underſtood of any *particular* way of *Spiritual Feeding*, but ſimply of *Spiritual Feeding*, be it in what way ſoever: Be it by *Baptiſm*, or by the *Euchariſt*, or by any other *Sacraments* (as under the old Law) or by any kind of Means which *Divine* Wiſdom ſhall chooſe, or has in Scripture ſignified. CHAP. VI.

FROM this ſummary View of the *Ancients* it may be obſerved, that They *varied* ſometimes in their Conſtructions of *John* VI, or of ſome Parts of it: But what prevailed moſt, and was the *general* Sentiment wherein they united, was, that Chriſt himſelf is properly and primarily our *Bread of Life*, conſidered as the *Word made Fleſh*, as *God Incarnate*, and *dying* for us; and that whatever elſe might, in a ſecondary Senſe, be called *Heavenly Bread* (whether *Sacraments*, or *Doctrines*, or any *Holy Service*) it was conſidered but as an *ante-paſt* to the other, or as the *ſame Thing* in the main, under a different Form of Expreſſion.

I SHALL here throw in a few Words concerning the Sentiments of *Moderns*, before I cloſe this Chapter. *Albertinus* [k] will furniſh the Reader with a competent Liſt of *Schoolmen*, and O-

k *Albertinus* de Euchariſtia, L. I. c. XXX. p. 209.

thers

CHAP. VI.

thers of the *Roman* Communion, who have rejected the *Sacramental* Interpretation of *John* VI. A more ſummary Account of the ſame may be ſeen in ABp. *Wake*[1], in the Collection of Pamphlets written againſt Popery in a late Reign. I know not whether the Authorities of that kind may be looked upon as ſo many *Conceſſions* from that Quarter, (tho' the *Romaniſts*, generally, contend earneſtly for the *Sacramental* Conſtruction) becauſe there may be Reaſons why the more conſidering *Romaniſts* ſhould think it *prudent* to give another Conſtruction, inaſmuch as *John* VI, if interpreted directly of the *Euchariſt*, would furniſh a ſtrong Argument for *Infant-Communion*, which They have long laid aſide; and it would be diametrically oppoſite to a noted Principle of theirs, of denying the *Cup* to the *Laity*. I cannot ſay how far theſe two Conſiderations may have inclined the ſhrewder Men amongſt them to reject what I call the *Sacramental* Conſtruction of *John* VI.

BUT the *Reformers*, in general, for very weighty Reaſons, have rejected the ſame: The *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* abroad, and our *own* moſt early and moſt conſiderable *Divines* have concurred in diſcarding it. It would be tedious to enter into a particular Recital of Authorities; And ſo I ſhall content myſelf with pointing out two or three of the moſt eminent, who may juſtly be allowed to ſpeak for the reſt. AB.

1 Diſcourſe of the Euchariſt, printed in 1687. p. 20. He numbers up 30 in all, thus: Two Popes, four Cardinals, two Archbiſhops, five Biſhops, the reſt Doctors and Profeſſors.

Cranmer

Cranmer ſtands at the Head of them: He had conſidered that Matter as cloſely perhaps as any Man before, or after Him, and determined in the main as judiciouſly. He writes thus: CHAP. VI.

" Whoe ever ſaid or taught before this " Tyme, that the *Sacrament* was the Cauſe " why Chriſt ſaid, *yf wee eate not the Fleſhe of* " *the Sonne of Man, wee have not Lyfe in us?* " The *Spiritual* eating of his Fleſh, and drinck- " ing of his Bloud by Faith, by digeſting his " *Death* in our Myndes, as our only *Pryce*, " *Raunſom*, and *Redemption* from eternal Damp- " nation, is the Cauſe wherfore Chriſte ſayd, " that *if wee eate not his Fleſhe, and drincke not* " *his Bloud, we have not Lyfe in us:* And *if* " *wee eate his Fleſhe and drincke his Bloud, wee* " *have everlaſting Lyfe.* And if Chriſt had ne- " ver ordeyned the *Sacrament*, yet ſhould wee " have eaten his Fleſhe and dronken his Bloud, " and have had therby everlaſting Lyfe, as al " the Faithful dyd before the *Sacrament* was " ordeyned, and doe daily, when thei receave " not the Sacrament —— That in the VI. of " *John* Chriſt ſpake nether of *Corporall* nor " *Sacramental* eating of his Fleſhe, the *Tyme* " manifeſtly ſheweth. For Chriſt ſpake of the " ſame *preſent* Tyme that was *then*, ſaying: " *The Bread which I will give, is my Fleſhe*, &c. " At whyche Tyme the *Sacramental* Bread " was not yet Chriſtes Fleſhe: For, the *Sacra-* " *ment* was not yet ordeyned; and yet at that " Tyme, all that beleved in Chriſt, did *eat his* " *Fleſh* and *drincke his Bloud*, or elles Thei

" coulde

CHAP. VI.

" coulde not have dwelled in Chriſt, nor Chriſt " in Them [m].

" This Symilityde cauſed oure Saviour to " ſay : *My Fleſhe is very Meate, and my Bloud* " *is very Drynke.* For, there is no kynde of " Meate that is comfortable to the Soule, but " only *the Death of Chriſtes Bleſſed Body* ; nor " no kynde of Drynke that can quenche her " Thirſt, but only the *Bloude ſheddyng* of our " Saviour Chriſt which was ſhed for her Of- " fences [n].

" I mervail here not a litle of Mr. *Smith*'s " either Dulnes, or Maliciouſnes, that cannot " or will not ſee, that Chriſt in this Chapter " of St. *John* ſpake not of *Sacramental* Bread, " but of *Hevenly Bread*; nor of his *Fleſh* on- " ly, but alſo of his *Bloud*, and of his *Godhead*, " calling them *Heavenly Bread* that giveth ever- " laſting Life. So that He ſpake of Himſelfe " wholly, ſaing : *I am the Bread of Life*, &c. " And nether ſpake He of *common* Bread, nor " yet of *Sacramental* Bread, for, nether of them " was given upon the Croſſe *for the Lyfe of* " *the World.* And there can be nothing more " *manifeſt*, than that in this VI*th* Chapter of " St. *John*, Chriſt ſpake not of the *Sacrament* " of his Fleſh, but of his *very Fleſh.* And " that as wel for that the *Sacrament* was *not* " *then inſtituted*, as alſo becauſe Chriſt ſaid not " in the *future* Tenſe The Bread which I will " give, *ſhall be* my Fleſh, but in the *preſent*

m ABp. *Cranmer* on the Sacrament, p. 22.
n *Cranmer*, p. 41. conf. *Calvin.* in Joh. VI. 54.

" Tenſe,

" Tenſe, the Bread which I will give, *is my* CHAP.
" *Fleſh:* Which *Sacramental* Bread was neither VI.
" *then* his Fleſh, nor was *then* inſtituted for a
" Sacrament, nor was after *given for the Life*
" *of the World.* —— When He ſaid, *the Bread*
" *which I wil give, is my Fleſh*, &c. He meant
" nether of the *materiall* Bread, nether of the
" *Accidents* of Bread, but of his *own Fleſh:*
" Which although of it ſelf it *availeth nothinge*,
" yet being in *unity of Perſon*, joyned unto
" his *Divinity*, it is the ſame Heavenly Bread
" that He gave to *Death* upon the Croſſe *for*
" *the Life of the World*[o]:

THUS far that excellent Perſon has ſhewn, by convincing Reaſons drawn from the Chapter itſelf, that *John* VI. ought not to be *interpreted* of the Euchariſt. Nevertheleſs, He very well knew, and did not forget to obſerve, that it may properly be *applied* or accommodated to the Euchariſt, and is of great Weight and Force for that very Purpoſe.

" As the Bread is outwardlie eaten indeede
" in the Lordes Supper, ſo is the very Body
" of Chriſt inwardly by Faith eaten indede of
" all them that come thereto in ſuch ſorte as
" Thei ought to doe; which eating nouryſh-
" eth them unto everlaſting Lyfe. And this
" eating hath a *Warrant ſigned by Chriſt Him-*
" *ſelfe in the* VI. *of John*, where Chriſt ſaith,
" He that eateth my Fleſh, and drincketh my

o *Cranmer*, p. 450. Compare Bp. *Jewell.* Defence of Apology, p. 306, &c. Anſwer to *Harding*, p. 78, 239, 240. *Fryth.* Anſw. to *More*, p. 21, 87.

" Bloud,

CHAP. VI.

" Bloud, hath Lyfe everlaſting [p]. You be the " firſt that ever *excluded* the Wordes of Chriſte " *from his Supper*. And St. *Auguſtine* mente, " as well *at the Supper*, as at all other Tymes, " that the eating of Chriſtes Fleſhe is not to be " underſtanded carnally with our Teeth, *&c* [q].

THE Sum then of ABp. *Cranmer*'s Doctrine on this Head is; 1. That *John* VI. is not to be interpreted of *oral* Manducation in the Sacrament, nor of Spiritual Manducation as *confined* to the Euchariſt, but of Spiritual Manducation *at large*, in That or any other Sacrament, or out of the Sacraments. 2. That *Spiritual* Manducation, in that Chapter, means the feeding upon Chriſt's *Death* and *Paſſion*, as the *Price* of our Redemption and Salvation. 3. That in ſo feeding we have a ſpiritual or myſtical *Union* with his *human Nature*, and by That with his *Godhead*, to which his Humanity is joined in an *Unity of Perſon*. 4. That ſuch *Spiritual* Manducation is a Privilege belonging to the Euchariſt, and therefore *John* VI. is not *foreign* to the Euchariſt, but has ſuch Relation to it as the inward Thing *ſignified* bears to the *outward Signs*.

To ABp. *Cranmer* I may ſubjoin *Peter Martyr*, who about ten Years after engaged in the ſame Cauſe, in a large *Latin* Treatiſe printed A. D. 1562. No Man has more clearly ſhewn, in few Words, how far *John* VI. belongs not to the Euchariſt, and how far it does. He conſiders the general Principles there taught

p *Cranmer*, p. 11. q *Cranmer*, p. 35.

as

as being *preparatory* to the *Inſtitution* of the Eu- CHAP.
chariſt, which was to come after. Our Lord VI.
in that Chapter gave intimation of *Spiritual Food*, with the uſe and neceſſity of it: Afterwards, in the Inſtitution, He added *external Symbols*, for the notifying one particular Act, or Inſtance of *Spiritual* Manducation, to make it the more ſolemn, and the more affecting. Therefore *John* VI. tho' not directly ſpoken of the Eucharist, yet is by no means *foreign*, but rather looks forward towards it, bears a tacit *Alluſion* to it, and ſerves to reflect Light upon it: For which Reaſon the ancient *Fathers* are to be commended for connecting the Account of *inward Grace* with the *outward Symbols*, the *Thing ſignified* with the *Signs* afterwards added, and ſo *applying* the Diſcourſe of that Chapter to the Caſe of the Euchariſt [r].

[r] De Sexto Capite Johannis, an ad Euchariſtiam pertineat, nos ita reſpondemus. Sermonem ibi de *Sacramento Cœnæ* non inſtitui; ibi enim Cœna cum *Symbolis* non ordinatur. Nam nec *Panis*, nec *Calicis*, nec *Gratiarum Actionis*, nec *Fractionis*, nec *Diſtributionis*, nec *Teſtamenti*, nec *Memoriæ*, nec *Annuntiationis* mortis Chriſti mentio ulla eo loco inſtituitur. Huc ſpectabant illi, qui dixerunt illud caput *ad Euchariſtiam non pertinere*, &c. —— Quoniam *Res ipſa* (id eſt, Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti *Spiritualis* Manducatio & Potus) ibi luculenter traditur, ad quam poſtea Evangeliſtæ, ad finem Hiſtoriæ ſuæ, declarant Chriſtum adjunxiſſe *Symbola externa* Panis & Vini, idcirco nos caput illud a Sacramento Euchariſtiæ *non putamus eſſe alienum*. —Imo *Patres* illos libenter recipimus, qui illa verba ad hoc negotium *tranſtulerunt*. Quid enim aliud ſibi volunt *Panis* & *Vinum*, quæ poſtea addita ſunt in Cœna, niſi ut magis excitemur ad *Manducationem illam* Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, quæ multis verbis diligentiſſime tractata fuerat in *Sexto Johannis*. Satis ergo apparet quemadmodum nos iſta conjungimus. *Petr. Mart.* p. 114, 115. conf. *Chamier.* de Euchariſt. L. XI. c. 3. &c.

CHAP. VI.

FROM what has been obſerved of theſe two eminent *Reformers*, we may judge how *John* VI. was underſtood at that Time: Not of *Doctrines*, nor of *Sacramental* feeding, but of *Spiritual* feeding at large, feeding upon the *Death* and *Paſſion* of Chriſt our Lord. This, I think, has been the prevailing Conſtruction of our own *Divines* all along: And tho' it has been much obſcured of late (for half a Century, perhaps, or more) by one, or other *Hypotheſis*, yet has it never been loſt[s], neither, I ſuppoſe, ever will be. A late very judicious Prelate of our Church, in a Sermon on *John* VI. 53. has well expreſſed the Senſe of our Church in this Matter, in the Words here following. "The *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt are to be underſtood in ſuch a Senſe as a *Soul* can be "ſuppoſed to feed upon a *Body*, or to receive "Strength and Nouriſhment by *feeding* upon "it. But now the *Body* of Chriſt can be no "otherwiſe as *Food* for the ſtrengthening and "refreſhing our Souls, than only as the *Spi*"*ritual Benefits* of that Body and Blood, that "is to ſay, the *Virtue and Effects of Chriſt's Sa*"*crifice* upon the Croſs, are communicated to

[s] Dean *Fogg*, in his excellent *Compendium* of *Divinity*, publiſhed A. D. 1712. has fully and diſtinctly expreſſed the Senſe of *John* VI. in two Lines:

Chriſtus ibi loquitur, non de Manducatione *Sacramentali*, ſed *Spirituali*, & de Pane *ſignificato*, non *ſignificante*.

Fogg. Theolog. Specul. Schema, p. 309.

Dr. *Wall* ſays; The Words of our Saviour to the Jews, *John* VI. 53. do no way appear to belong to the *Sacramental* eating, which was not then inſtituted. *Wall*. Inf. Bapt. Part. II. c. 9. p. 448. 3*d* Edit.

"it;

" it; nor is the Soul capable of receiving thoſe CHAP.
" Benefits otherwiſe than by *Faith*. So that VI.
" the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, in the Senſe
" of our Church, are only the *Benefits of*
" *Chriſt's Paſſion*; that is to ſay, the *Pardon of*
" *Sin*, and the *Grace* of the *Holy Spirit*, and a
" *nearer Union with Chriſt*: And our *eating* and
" *drinking* of that Body and Blood, is our be-
" ing *Partakers* of thoſe *Benefits*; and the *Mouth*
" whereby we thus eat and drink, that is, the
" *Means* whereby we are made Partakers of
" thoſe Benefits, is our true and lively Faith [t].
This Account is formed upon our *Catechiſm*, and upon the old Principles of our firſt *Reformers* and the next ſucceeding *Divines*, before any refined Speculations came in to obſcure or perplex a plain Notion, and a very important Truth. All I have to obſerve farther upon it, by way of Explanation, is as follows:
1. When the learned Author ſays, that *the Soul is not capable of receiving thoſe Benefits otherwiſe than by Faith*, I underſtand it of *Adult Chriſtians*, and of what they are *ordinarily* capable of: God may *extraordinarily* apply the Benefits of Chriſt's Paſſion wherever there is no *moral* Obſtacle, as He pleaſes. And it ſhould be noted that, properly ſpeaking, we do not *apply* thoſe Benefits to our ſelves, we only *receive*, or (by the Help of God's Grace) *qualify* our ſelves for receiving: It is *God* that *applies* [u], as

[t] ABp. *Sharp*. Vol. VII. Sermon XV. p. 366.
[u] *Fides* magis proprie dicitur *accipere* & *apprehendere*, quam vel *polliceri*, vel *præſtare*. Sed verbum Dei & Promiſſio cui Fi-

CHAP. VI.

as it is alſo God that *juſtifies*; and He does it ordinarily in and by the *Sacraments* to Perſons *fitly* prepared. 2. When it is ſaid, that the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, in the Senſe of our Church, *are only the Benefits of Chriſt's Paſſion*, I ſo underſtand it, as not to exclude all Reference to our Lord's *glorified Body* now in Heaven, with which we maintain a *myſtical* Union, and which is itſelf one of the *Benefits* conſequent upon our partaking of Chriſt's Paſſion; as ſeems to be intimated by the Author Himſelf, where He reckons a *nearer Union with Chriſt* among the *Benefits*. 3. The judicious Author rightly makes *Faith* to be the *Mouth* only, by which we receive, not the *Meat*, or *Drink* which we do receive; the *Means* only of Spiritual Nutriment, not the *Nutriment* itſelf: For the Nutriment itſelf is *Pardon* and *Grace* coming down from above, flowing from the *ſpiritual* and *gracious* Preſence of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, whoſe *Temple* we are, while we are *living* Members of Chriſt.

des innititur, non vero *Fides* Hominum, *præſentia* reddit quæ promittit; quemadmodum inter *Reformatos* & *Pontificios* aliquot conſenſum eſt in *Collatione Sangermani* habita 1561. Male enim a multis *Romanenſibus* nobis objicitur, quaſi crederemus hanc Chriſti Præſentiam & communicationem in Sacramento, per nudam *Fidem* tantum effici. *Coſin.* Hiſtor. Tranſubſt. c. II. §. 8. p. 17, 18.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning Sacramental, or Symbolical Feeding in the EUCHARIST.

AFTER conſidering *Spiritual Manducation* by itſelf, independent of any particular Modes, Forms, or Circumſtances, it will next be proper to take a View of it as ſet forth in a *ſenſible* Way, with the additional Garniture of *Signs* and *Symbols*. Under the old Teſtament, beſides the ordinary *Sacrifices*, the *Manna* and the *Waters* of the Rock were *Signs* and *Symbols* of Spiritual Manducation, according to St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, where He teaches, that the ancient Iſraelites *did all eat the ſame Spiritual Meat, and did all drink the ſame Spiritual Drink* [w] which Chriſtians do; the ſame with ours as to the Spiritual Signification of it: So I underſtand the Place, with many judicious Interpreters, both *Antients* [x] and *Moderns* [y]. As the Heavenly Meat and Drink of the true Iſraelites was *Chriſt*, according to the Apoſtle, and Chriſt alſo is *ours*, the Apoſtle muſt be underſtood to teach, that They fed upon the ſame Heavenly Food that we do; only by different *Symbols*, and in a *fainter*

[w] 1 *Cor.* X. 3, 4.

[x] *Auſtin*, *Bede*, *Bertram*, and others.

[y] Beſides Commentators, ſee ABp. *Cranmer* on the Sacrament, p. 86. &c. Bp. *Jewell*, Treatiſe on the Sacrament. *Mede*, Diſcourſe 43. p. 325. &c. Bp. *Moreton* on the Sacrament B. V. Ch. 2. S. 3. p. 314.

CHAP. VII.

Light. The Symbols are there called *Spiritual* Meat and Drink, that is, *myſtical*; for they *ſignified* the true Food, which none but the *true* Iſraelites were fed with, while *All* received the *Signs*. In the New Teſtament, the *Bread* and *Wine* of the Euchariſt are the appointed *Symbols* of the Spiritual Bleſſings, but under clearer and brighter Manifeſtations. For proof hereof we muſt look back to the original *Inſtitution* of the Sacrament, and particularly to the Words, *This is my Body*, &c. and *This is my Blood*, &c. To undertake the Expoſition of them is entring into the moſt perplexed and intricate Part of the whole Subject; made ſo by an odd Series of Incidents, in a long Tract of Time, and remaining as a ſtanding Monument of *Human Infirmities:* In conſideration whereof, *Moderns*, of all Parties, may perhaps ſee reaſon not to bear themſelves high above the *Ancients*, in point of Wiſdom, or Sagacity. The plain obvious Notion, which no body almoſt could miſs of for ſix or ſeven Centuries, came at length to be obſcured in *dark* Ages, and by degrees to be almoſt totally loſt. It was no very eaſy Matter to recover it afterwards, or to clear off the Miſts at once. Contentions aroſe, even among the Elucidators: And what was worſt of all, after that in every Scheme propoſed, at the *Reformation*, ſome Difficulties remained, which could not of a ſudden be perfectly adjuſted, there appeared at length ſome enterprizing Perſons, who either for ſhortening Diſputes, or for other Cauſes

Cauſes, laboured to depretiate the *Sacraments* themſelves, as if They were ſcarce worth the contending for: Which was puſhing Matters to the moſt dangerous and pernicious Extreme that could be invented. But I paſs on. CHAP. VII.

FOR the clearer apprehending what that *plain* and *eaſy* Notion was, which I juſt now ſpake of, I chuſe to begin with a famous Paſſage of St. *Bernard*, often quoted in this Subject, and very uſeful to give the Readers a good general Idea of the *Symbolical* Nature of the Sacraments. He compares them with *Inſtruments* of *Inveſtiture* (into *Lands*, *Honours*, *Dignities*) which are *ſignificant* and *emblematical* of what they belong to, and are at the ſame Time *Means* of Conveyance [z]. A *Book*, a *Ring*, a *Croſier*, and the like, have often been made uſe of as *Inſtruments* for ſuch Purpoſe. They are not without their *Significancy* in the way of inſtructive *Emblem:* But what is moſt conſiderable, They are Inſtruments to *convey* thoſe Rights, Privileges, Honours, Offices, Poſſeſſions, which in ſilent Language they point to. Thoſe ſmall *Gifts*, or *Pledges* are as nothing in themſelves, but They are highly valuable with reſpect to *what* they are Pledges of, and what they legally and effectively *convey:* So it is with the *Signs* and *Symbols* of both *Sacraments*, and particularly, with the *Elements* of Bread and

[z] Variæ ſunt Inveſtituræ ſecundum ea quibus inveſtimur: Verbi gratiâ, inveſtitur *Canonicus* per *Librum*, *Abbas* per *Baculum* & *Annulum* ſimul: Sicut, inquam, in ejuſmodi Rebus eſt, ſic & diviſiones Gratiarum diverſis ſunt traditæ Sacramentis. *Bernard.* de Cœn. Domini Serm. 1. p. 145.

CHAP. VII.

Wine in the Euchariſt. They are, after Conſecration, called by the *Names* of what they are *Pledges* of, and are ordained to *convey*; becauſe they are, tho' not *literally*, yet in *juſt Conſtruction* and *certain Effect*, (ſtanding on *Divine* Promiſe, and *Divine* Acceptance) the very Things which they are called, *viz.* The *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt to all *worthy* Receivers. In *themſelves* they are *Bread* and *Wine* from firſt to laſt: But while they are made uſe of in the Holy Service, they are *conſidered*, *conſtrued*, *underſtood* (purſuant to Divine Law, Promiſe, Covenant) as ſtanding for what they *repreſent* and *exhibit*. Thus frequently, in Human Affairs, Things or Perſons are *conſidered* very differently from what they really are in themſelves, by a kind of *Conſtruction of Law*: And They are ſuppoſed to be, to all Intents and Purpoſes, and in full *legal Effect*, what they are preſumed to ſerve for, and to ſupply the Place of.

A *Deed* of *Conveyance*, or any like *Inſtrument* under Hand and Seal, is not a *real* Eſtate, but it *conveys* one; and it is in *Effect* the Eſtate it ſelf, as the Eſtate goes along with it; and as the *Right*, *Title*, and *Property* (which are *real* Acquirements) are, as it were, bound up in it, and ſubſiſt by it [a]. If any Perſon ſhould ſeriouſly

[a] Our very judicious *Hooker* has explained this Matter much the ſame way, in theſe Words, as ſpoken by our Lord.

"This Hallowed Food, thro' the Concurrence of a divine "Power, is in *Verity* and *Truth*, unto faithful Receivers, *inſtru-* "*mentally* a Cauſe of that myſtical Participation; whereby as I "*make*

riouſly object, in ſuch a Caſe, that He ſees nothing but *Wax* and *Parchments*, and that He does not apprehend how they can be of any extraordinary *value* to Him, or how He is made *richer* by them; He might be pitied, I preſume, for his unthinking Ignorance, or Simplicity: But if, in a contrary Extreme, He ſhould be credulous enough to imagine, that the *Parchments* themſelves are really and *literally* the Eſtate, are ſo many *Houſes* or *Tenements*, or *Acres* of *Glebe*, incloſed in his Cabinet, He could not well be preſumed to be far ſhort of Diſtraction. I leave it to the intelligent Reader, to make the Application proper to the preſent Subject. I have ſuppoſed, all the while, that the Caſes are ſo far parallel: But whether they really are ſo, muſt now be the Point of Enquiry; for I am ſenſible that the Thing is too important to be taken for granted.

COME we then directly to conſider the Words, *This is my Body:* And *This is my Blood.* What can they, or what do they mean?

1. THEY cannot mean, that This *Bread* and This *Wine* are really and literally That Body in the ſame *broken* State as it hung upon the Croſs, and that Blood which was ſpilled upon the Ground 1700 Years ago. Neither yet can they mean that this Bread and Wine literally and properly are our Lord's *glorified Body*, which

" *make my ſelf wholly theirs*, ſo I *give them in hand* an actual " *Poſſeſſion* of all ſuch Graces as my ſacrificed Body can yield, " and as their Souls do preſently need: *This is to Them my Body.* *Hooker* p. 310. conf. *Coſin.* Hiſtor. Tranſubſt. p. 57, 58.

CHAP. VII.

is as far distant from us, as *Heaven* is distant: All *Sense*, all *Reason*, all *Scripture*, all *Antiquity* and sound *Theology* reclaim against so wild a Thought.

2. WELL then, since the Words cannot be understood *literally*, or with utmost *rigour*, they must be brought under some *Figure* or other, some softening Explication, to make them both *Sense*, and *Truth*.

3. BUT there may be danger of undercommenting, as well as of interpreting too high: And Men may recede so far from the *Letter* as altogether to dilute the Meaning, or break its Force. As nothing but *necessity* can warrant us in going from the *Letter* at all, we ought not to go farther than such necessity requires. There appears to be something very solemn and awful in our Lord's pointed Words: *This is my Body*, and *This my Blood*. Had He intended no more than a bare *Commemoration*, or *Representation*, it might have been sufficient to have said, *Eat this Bread broken*, and *drink this Wine poured out*, in remembrance of me and my Passion, without declaring in that strong Manner that the Bread and Wine *are* his Body and Blood, at the same Time commanding his Disciples to *take* them as such. We ought to look out for some as high and significant a Meaning as the nature of the Thing can admit of, in order to answer such *emphatical* Words, and Gestures.

4. SOME, receding from the *Letter*, have supposed the Words to mean, this Bread and this

this Wine are my Body and Blood *in Power and Effect*, or in *Virtue and Energy:* Which is not much amiſs, excepting that it ſeems to carry in it ſome obſcure Conception either of an *inherent* or *infuſed* Virtue reſting upon the bare *Elements*, and operating as a *Mean*, which is not the Truth of the Caſe; excepting alſo, that it leaves us but a very dark and confuſed Idea of what the Lord's *Body* or *Blood* means, in that way of ſpeaking, whether *natural*, or *Sacramental*, or both in one. CHAP. VII.

5. IT appears more reaſonable, and more proper to ſay, that the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood (*viz.* the *natural* Body and Blood) in *juſt Conſtruction*, put upon them by the Lawgiver Himſelf, who has ſo appointed, and who is able to make it good. The Symbols are not the Body in *Power* and *Effect*, if thoſe Words mean *efficiency:* But, ſuitable Diſpoſitions ſuppoſed in the Recipient, the *delivery* of theſe Symbols is, in *Conſtruction* of Goſpel-Law, and in *divine* Intention, and therefore in certain *Effect*, or *Conſequence*, a delivery of the *Things* ſignified. If God hath been pleaſed ſo to order, that theſe outward Elements, in the due uſe of the Euchariſt, ſhall be *imputed to* us, and *accepted* by Him, as Pledges of the *natural* Body of our Lord, and that this *conſtructional* intermingling his Body and Blood with ours, ſhall be the ſame Thing *in effect* with our *adhering* inſeparably to Him, as *Members* or *Parcels* of Him; then thoſe outward Symbols are, tho' not *literally*, yet *interpretatively*

CHAP. VII.

pretatively and to all *ſaving* Purpoſes, that very Body and Blood which they ſo repreſent *with Effect:* They are appointed inſtead of them [b].

THIS Notion of the Sacrament, as it is both intelligible and reaſonable, ſo is it likewiſe entirely conſonant to Scripture-Language; conſidered firſt, in the *general*; next, with reſpect to the Jewiſh *Sacrifices*, and *Sacraments*; then with regard alſo to Chriſtian *Baptiſm*; and laſtly, with reſpect to what is elſewhere taught of the *Euchariſt*. Further, it appears to have been the *antient* Notion of all the Chriſtian Churches for ſix Centuries or more; and was ſcarce ſo much as *obſcured* till very corrupt and ignorant Ages came up, and was never totally loſt, tho' almoſt ſwallowed up for a Time by the prevailing growth of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Theſe Particulars I ſhall now endeavour to prove diſtinctly, in the ſame order as I have named them.

1. I UNDERTAKE to ſhew that the Interpretation here given is favoured by the *general* Style, or Phraſeology of Scripture; which abounds with Examples of ſuch *figurative* and *conſtructional* Expreſſions, where one Thing is *mentioned*, and another *underſtood*, according to the way which I have before intimated. I do not here refer to ſuch Inſtances as are often produced in this Subject; as *metaphorical* Locutions, when our Lord is ſtyled a *Door*, a *Vine*,

[b] Τὸ ποτήριον ἐν πάξει αἵματος ἡγειῶς, is the Phraſe of *Victor Antiochenus*, who wrote about A. D. 401. Vid. *Albertin.* p. 832.

a *Star*,

a *Star*, a *Sun*, a *Rock*, a *Lamb*, a *Lion*, or the like; which amount only to ſo many *Similitudes* couched, every one reſpectively, under a ſingle Word. Neither do I point to other well-known Inſtances, of *ſeven Kine* being *ſeven Years*, and *four great Beaſts* being *four Kings*, and the *Field* being the *World*, *Reapers* being *Angels*, and the like: Which appertain only to *viſional* or *parabolical* Repreſentations, and come not up to the Point in hand. The Examples which we are to ſeek for, as ſimilar and parallel to the Expreſſions made uſe of by our Lord in the *Inſtitution*, muſt be thoſe wherein ſome *real Thing* is in *juſt Conſtruction*, and *certain Effect*, allowed to be *another Thing*.

MOSES *was a God* to *Pharaoh*[c], not literally but *in Effect*. The walking *Tabernacle*, or moving *Ark*, being a *Symbol* of the Divine Preſence, was *conſidered* as God walking[d] among his People. *Faith* was reckoned to *Abraham* as Righteouſneſs[e], or ſinleſs Perfection; not that it ſtrictly or literally was ſo, but it was ſo *accepted* in God's Account. *John* the Baptiſt was *Elias*[f], not literally, but in juſt Conſtruction. Man and Wife are *one Fleſh*[g], not in the utmoſt ſtrictneſs of Speech, but *interpretatively*, or in Effect; they are *conſider'd* as one. He that is joined to an *Harlot*, is *one Body*[h],

[c] *Exod.* VII. 1.
[d] *Levit.* XXVI. 11, 12. *Deut.* XXIII. 14.
[e] *Gen.* XV. 6. *Rom.* IV. 3, 9, 22. *Gal.* III. 6.
[f] *Matt.* XVII. 12. *Mark* IX. 13.
[g] 1 *Cor.* VI. 16. [h] 1 *Cor.* VI. 16.

not

CHAP. VII. not literally, but in *Conſtruction* of Divine Law: And he that is joined unto the Lord is *one Spirit*[i], is *conſidered* as ſo, and with real Effect. The *Church* is our *Lord's Body*[k], interpretatively ſo. *Levi* paid Tithes in *Abraham*, not literally, but conſtructionally, or as one *may ſay*[l]. *Abraham* received his Son *Iſaac* from the dead, not really, but in juſt Conſtruction, and *in a Figure*[m]. The Apoſtle tells his new Converts; Ye *are our Epiſtle*, and the *Epiſtle of Chriſt*[n]; that is to ſay, *inſtead* of an Epiſtle, or *equivalent* thereto; the ſame Thing in Effect, or Uſe. Theſe Examples may ſuffice to ſhew, in the *general*, that Scripture is no Stranger to the *Symbolical*, or *Conſtructional* Language, expreſſing *one Thing* by *another Thing*, conſidered as equivalent thereto, and amounting to the ſame as to real Effects or Purpoſes.

2. THIS will appear ſtill plainer from the *Sacrificial* Language and Uſage in the Old Teſtament. *Blood*, in Sacrificial Language, was the *Life* of an Animal: And the ſhedding the Blood for Sacrifice, together with the ſprinkling it, were underſtood to be giving *Life* for *Life*[o]. The *Fumes* of ſome Sacrifices were *conſidered* as *ſweet Odours*[p], grateful to God when ſent up with a pure Mind. The *Altar* was conſi-

[i] 1 *Cor.* VI. 17.
[k] *Epheſ.* I. 23. See *Spinkes* againſt *Tranſubſtant.* p. 29, 30.
[l] *Hebr.* VII. 9. [m] *Hebr.* XI. 19.
[n] 2 *Cor.* III. 2, 3.
[o] *Gen.* IX. 4. *Levit.* XVII. 10, 11.
[p] *Gen.* VIII. 21. *Exod.* XXIX. 18. & paſſim.

dered

dered as God's *Table*[q]: And what was *offered* upon it, and conſumed by *Fire*, was conſtrued and accepted as God's *Meat*, *Bread*, *Food*, *Portion*, or *Meſs*[r]. Not that it was *literally* ſo, but it was all one to the Supplicants; with whom God dealt as kindly, as if it had really been ſo: It was the ſame Thing in legal *Account*, was *Symbolically* the ſame, and therefore ſo *named*. The *laying Hands* upon the *Head* of the Victim was, in *Conſtruction* of Divine Law, *transferring* the legal Offences upon the Victim[s]: More particularly, the Peoples performing that Ceremony towards the *Scape-Goat*, was conſidered as *laying* their *Iniquities* upon Him, which accordingly the Goat was ſuppoſed to *bear away* with Him[t]; all which was true in *legal* Account. The Prieſts in eating the *Sin-Offering* of the People, were conſidered as eating up their Guilt, incorporating it with themſelves, and diſcharging the People of it[v]: And the *Effect* anſwered. But when the People feaſted on the *Peace-Offerings*, it was ſymbolically eating *Peace*, and maintaining Amity with God: To which St. *Paul* alludes in a noted Paſſage[w], to be explained hereafter. From hence it may be obſerved by the way, that *Symbolical* Phraſes

CHAP. VII.

[q] *Ezek.* XLI. 22. XLIV. 16. *Mal.* I. 7, 12.
[r] *Levit.* III. 11. XXI. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22, 25. *Numb.* XXVIII. 2, 24. *Ezek.* XLIV. 7.
[s] *Levit.* I. 4. VIII. 14, 15.
[t] *Levit.* XVI. 21, 22.
[v] *Levit.* X. 17. *Hoſ.* IV. 8.
[w] 1 *Cor.* X. 18. Compare *Levit.* VII. 18. and *Ainſworth* in loc.

and

CHAP. VII. and *Symbolical* Services were what the Jews had been much and long uſed to, before our Lord's Time: Which may be one Reaſon why the Apoſtles ſhewed no ſurprize at what was ſaid to them in the *Inſtitution* of the Euchariſt, nor called for any Explanation.

FROM the Jewiſh *Sacrifices*, we may paſs on to their *Sacraments*, which, taking the Word in a large Senſe, were *many*, but in the ſtricter Senſe were but *two*, namely, *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſover*. With reſpect to Thoſe alſo, the like *figurative* and *Symbolical* Language prevailed. We find St. *Paul* declaring of the *Manna* and of the *Waters* of old, that they were *Spiritual* Food; and accordingly He does not ſcruple, while ſpeaking of the *Rock* from whence the Waters flowed, to ſay that *That Rock was Chriſt*[x]. It typified Chriſt: Yea and more than ſo, the *Waters* which it yielded, typified the Blood and Water which ſhould afterwards flow from our Lord's *Side*, and were to the *Faithful* of that Time, *Spiritual* Pledges of the *Benefits* of Chriſt's Paſſion, like as the Sacramental *Wine* is now[y]. This Conſideration fully accounts for the ſtrong Expreſſion which the Apoſtle in that Caſe made uſe of, *That Rock was Chriſt:* It was ſo in Effect to every *true* Iſraelite of that Time.

CIRCUMCISION of the *Fleſh* was a *Symbolical* Rite, betokening the true *Circumciſion* of the *Heart*; which was the *Condition* of the *Co-*

[x] 1 *Cor.* X. 4.
[y] See above, p. 197.

venant

venant between God and his People, on their Part[z], and God's *Acceptance* of the ſame on his Part[a], to all ſaving Purpoſes: Therefore Circumciſion had the Name of *Covenant*, and the *Sign* was called what it *literally* was not, but what it really and truly *ſignified*, and to the Faithful *exhibited*[b]. CHAP. VII.

THE like may be obſerved of the *Paſſover*, which was feaſting upon a *Lamb*, but was called the *Lord's Paſſover*, as looking backwards, plainly, to the Angel's *paſſing over* the *Hebrews*, ſo as to preſerve them from the *Plague*[c] then inflicted on the *Egyptians*, and myſtically looking forwards to God's *paſſing over* the Sins of Mankind, for the Sake of Chriſt the true Paſchal *Lamb*[d]. Such is the cuſtomary Language of Scripture in thoſe Caſes, denominating the *Signs* by the Things *ſignified*, and at the ſame Time *exhibited* in a qualified Senſe.

3. I PROCEED to the Conſideration of *Baptiſm*, a Sacrament of the New Teſtament; a *Symbolical* Rite, full of Figure and Myſtery; *repreſenting* divers Graces, Bleſſings, Privileges, and *exhibiting* the ſame in the very Act: For which Reaſon the Scripture-Language concerning it is very ſtrong, and emphatical, like to what our Lord made uſe of with reſpect to the Euchariſt. St. *Paul* does not barely intimate that we *ought to be* buried with Chriſt

[z] *Deut.* X. 16. XXX. 6. *Levit.* XXVI. 41. *Jerem.* IV. 4. *Rom.* II. 28, 29.
[a] *Gen.* XVII. 7. [b] *Gen.* XVII. 10, 13, 14.
[c] *Exod.* XII. 11, 12, 13. [d] 1 *Cor.* V. 7.

CHAP. VII.

in Baptiſm, or that we *ſignify* his Burial, but He ſays plainly, *we are buried*; and likewiſe that we *have been planted* together in the likeneſs of his Death, and that our old Man *is crucified*, and that we *are freed from Sin*, and *dead with Chriſt*[e]. The Reaſon is, becauſe the Things there mentioned, are not merely *repreſented*, but *effectuated* always on God's Part, if there be no failure, or obſtacle on ours. The *Spiritual* Graces of Baptiſm go along with the Ceremony, in the *due* uſe of it, and are ſuppoſed by the Apoſtle to be convey'd at that Inſtant. 1. Actual Remiſſion of Sins[f]. 2. Preſent Sanctification of the Spirit[g]. 3. Actual Communion with Chriſt's Body, with Chriſt our Head[h]. 4. A certain Title, for the Time being, to *Reſurrection*, and *Salvation*[i]. 5. A putting on Chriſt[k]. I take the more Notice here of the laſt Article of *putting on Chriſt*, as being of near affinity with *feeding upon Chriſt*

[e] *Rom.* VI. 4, 6, 7, 8. De ipſo Baptiſmo Apoſtolus, *conſepulti*, inquit, *ſumus Chriſto per Baptiſmum in mortem.* Non ait Sepulturam *ſignificavimus*, ſed prorſus ait, *conſepulti ſumus:* Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non niſi *ejuſdem Rei* vocabulo nuncupavit. *Auguſtin.* Ep. 98. ad Bonifac. p. 268. Edit. Bened.

[f] *Acts* XXII. 16. II. 38. *Coloſſ.* II. 13. 1 *Cor.* VI. 11.

[g] *John* III. 5. *Acts* II. 38. 1 *Cor.* XII. 13. VI. 11. *Epheſ.* V. 26. *Tit.* III. 5. *Hebr.* X. 22.

[h] 1 *Cor.* XII. 13.

[i] *Rom.* VI. 8, 9. *Tit.* III. 5. 1 *Pet.* III. 21. *Coloſſ.* II. 11, 12, 13. Add 1 *Cor.* XV. 29. For ſo I underſtand *baptizing for the Dead*; in order to have our *dead* Bodies *raiſed*. Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* in 1 *Cor.* X. Hom. 23. p. 389. & in *Cor.* XV. 29. Hom. 40. p. 513. Ed. Sav. *Iſidor. Peluſ.* Epiſt. Lib. 1. Ep. 221. *Theodorit.* in 1 *Cor.* XV. 29.

[k] *Gal.* III. 27. conf. *Wolfius* in loc. *Deylingius* Obſ. Sacr. Tom. III. p. 330.

in

in the other Sacrament. Both of them expreſs a near Conjunction, and cloſe Intimacy: But the latter is the *ſtronger* Figure, and the more *affecting* Emblem. Chriſt is, in a qualified Senſe, our *Cloathing*, and our *Food*; our Baptiſmal *Garment*, and our Euchariſtical *Banquet:* But what enters *within us*, and is *diffuſed* all over us, and becomes *incorporate* with us, being conſidered as a *Symbol* of Chriſt, expreſſes the moſt intimate Union and Coalition imaginable. Probably, this *Symbol* was made choice of for the *Euchariſt*, as it is the Top Perfection of Chriſtian Worſhip, or Service. Baptiſm is for *Babes* in Chriſt, This for *grown Men:* Baptiſm *initiates*, while the Euchariſt *perfects:* Baptiſm *begins* the Spiritual Life, the Euchariſt carries on and *finiſhes* it. And therefore it is, that the Euchariſt has ſo frequently been called τὸ τέλειον[l], The *perfecting* Service, and the *Sacrament of Sacraments*[m]; or emphatically *The Sacrament*, which obtains at this Day. I may add that, tho' Baptiſm repreſents the *Burial* and the *Reſurrection* of our Lord, and entitles us to a Partnerſhip in Both, yet there is ſomething ſtill more awful and venerable in repreſenting (not merely his *Acts*, or *Offices*, but)

CHAP. VII.

[l] Vid. *Caſaub.* Exercit. XVI. N. 48. p. 411. alias 572. *Suicer.* Theſaur. Tom. II. p. 1259.

Conjunctioni noſtræ cum Chriſto, cujus inſtrumenta ſunt *verbum* Dei & Sacramenta, veluti *Colophonem* imponit Participatio Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti in Cœna Dominica: Nullus enim reſtat alius modus, quo in terris verſantes *arctius* cum Chriſto, capite noſtro, conjungamur. *Caſaub.* ibid.

[m] Τελετῶν τελετή. Pſeudo-Dionyſ. c. III. p. 282.

CHAP. VII.

in Baptiſm, or that we *ſignify* his Burial, but He ſays plainly, *we are buried*; and likewiſe that we *have been planted* together in the likeneſs of his Death, and that our old Man *is crucified*, and that we *are freed from Sin*, and *dead with Chriſt*[e]. The Reaſon is, becauſe the Things there mentioned, are not merely *repreſented*, but *effectuated* always on God's Part, if there be no failure, or obſtacle on ours. The *Spiritual* Graces of Baptiſm go along with the Ceremony, in the *due* uſe of it, and are ſuppoſed by the Apoſtle to be convey'd at that Inſtant. 1. Actual Remiſſion of Sins[f]. 2. Preſent Sanctification of the Spirit[g]. 3. Actual Communion with Chriſt's Body, with Chriſt our Head[h]. 4. A certain Title, for the Time being, to *Reſurrection*, and *Salvation*[i]. 5. A putting on Chriſt[k]. I take the more Notice here of the laſt Article of *putting on Chriſt*, as being of near affinity with *feeding upon Chriſt*

[e] *Rom.* VI. 4, 6, 7, 8. De ipſo Baptiſmo Apoſtolus, *conſepulti*, inquit, *ſumus Chriſto per Baptiſmum in mortem.* Non ait Sepulturam *ſignificavimus*, ſed prorſus ait, *conſepulti ſumus:* Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non niſi *ejuſdem Rei* vocabulo nuncupavit. *Auguſtin.* Ep. 98. ad Bonifac. p. 268. Edit. Bened.

[f] *Acts* XXII. 16. II. 38. *Coloſſ.* II. 13. 1 *Cor.* VI. 11.

[g] *John* III. 5. *Acts* II. 38. 1 *Cor.* XII. 13. VI. 11. *Epheſ.* V. 26. *Tit.* III. 5. *Hebr.* X. 22.

[h] 1 *Cor.* XII. 13.

[i] *Rom.* VI. 8, 9. *Tit.* III. 5. 1 *Pet.* III. 21. *Coloſſ.* II. 11, 12, 13. Add 1 *Cor.* XV. 29. For ſo I underſtand *baptizing for the Dead*; in order to have our *dead* Bodies *raiſed*. Vid. *Chryſoſtom.* in 1 *Cor.* X. Hom. 23. p. 389. & in *Cor.* XV. 29. Hom. 40. p. 513. Ed. Sav. *Iſidor. Peluſ.* Epiſt. Lib. 1. Ep. 221. *Theodorit.* in 1 *Cor.* XV. 29.

[k] *Gal.* III. 27. conf. *Wolfius* in loc. *Deylingius* Obſ. Sacr. Tom. III. p. 330.

in

in the other Sacrament. Both of them expreſs a near Conjunction, and cloſe Intimacy: But the latter is the *ſtronger* Figure, and the more *affecting* Emblem. Chriſt is, in a qualified Senſe, our *Cloathing*, and our *Food*; our Baptiſmal *Garment*, and our Euchariſtical *Banquet*: But what enters *within us*, and is *diffuſed* all over us, and becomes *incorporate* with us, being conſidered as a *Symbol* of Chriſt, expreſſes the moſt intimate Union and Coalition imaginable. Probably, this *Symbol* was made choice of for the *Euchariſt*, as it is the Top Perfection of Chriſtian Worſhip, or Service. Baptiſm is for *Babes* in Chriſt, This for *grown Men*: Baptiſm *initiates*, while the Euchariſt *perfects*: Baptiſm *begins* the Spiritual Life, the Euchariſt carries on and *finiſhes* it. And therefore it is, that the Euchariſt has ſo frequently been called τὸ τέλειον[l], The *perfecting* Service, and the *Sacrament of Sacraments*[m]; or emphatically *The Sacrament*, which obtains at this Day. I may add that, tho' Baptiſm repreſents the *Burial* and the *Reſurrection* of our Lord, and entitles us to a Partnerſhip in Both, yet there is ſomething ſtill more awful and venerable in repreſenting (not merely his *Acts*, or *Offices*, but)

CHAP. VII.

[l] Vid. *Caſaub.* Exercit. XVI. N. 48. p. 411. alias 572. *Suicer.* Theſaur. Tom. II. p. 1259.

Conjunctioni noſtræ cum Chriſto, cujus inſtrumenta ſunt *verbum* Dei & Sacramenta, veluti *Colophonem* imponit Participatio Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti in Cœna Dominica: Nullus enim reſtat alius modus, quo in terris verſantes *arctius* cum Chriſto, capite noſtro, conjungamur. *Caſaub.* ibid.

[m] Τελετῶν τελετή. Pſeudo-Dionyſ. c. III. p. 282.

CHAP. VII.

his very *Perſon*, in Part, which is done in the Euchariſt, by the Symbols of Bread and Wine, repreſenting his *Body* and *Blood*.

FROM what hath been ſaid under this laſt Article, concerning *Baptiſm*, we may obſerve, that it is not *literally* going into the Grave with Chriſt, neither is it *literally* riſing from the Dead with Him; but it is ſo *interpretatively* and in certain *Effect*, proper Diſpoſitions ſuppoſed on our Part: And it is not barely a *Repreſentation* of a Thing, but a real *Exhibition*. So likewiſe in the Euchariſt: The Elements are not literally what they are called, but they are *interpretatively* and *in Effect* the ſame Thing with what they ſtand for. Such appears to be the true Account of the *Symbolical* Phraſes of the Inſtitution.

4. TO this agrees what we meet with farther in St. *Paul*'s Account of this Sacrament. It is the *Communion* of the Body and Blood of Chriſt [n]. Which expreſſes *Communication* on the Part of the Donor, and *Participation* on the Side of the Receiver. There is Communication from God, and a Participation by us, of Chriſt's *crucified* Body directly, and of the Body *glorified* conſequentially. Yet this *Grant*, and this *Reception* of our Lord's Body are not to be underſtood with utmoſt rigour, but after the manner of *Symbolical* Grants and Conveyances; where the *Symbols* are conſtrued to be in *real* and *beneficial* Effect, what they ſupply the Place of. But of this Text I may have occaſion to ſay

[n] 1 *Cor.* X. 16.

more

more in a diſtinct Chapter, and ſo may diſ- CHAP. miſs it for the preſent. VII.

St. *Paul*, in the ſame Epiſtle, ſpeaks of the *unworthy* Receiver, as *guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and as *eating and drinking Damnation to Himſelf, not diſcerning the Lord's Body*[o]: All which is eaſily and naturally accounted for, upon the Principles before mention'd. Our Lord's *Body* is interpretatively *delivered*, with all the Emoluments thereunto pertaining, to as many as receive *worthily:* The ſame *Body* is interpretatively *offered*[p] to as many as receive, tho' ever ſo *unworthily*. The *unworthy* Receiver, thro' his own Fault, diſqualifies himſelf from *partaking* of what is *offered*, namely from partaking of the *Things ſignified:* Which being our Lord's own *Body* and *Blood*, He is therefore guilty not only of profaning *Holy Things* (as even the *Symbols* themſelves, when conſecrated, are *Holy*) but alſo of ſlighting and contemning our Lord's own *Body* and *Blood*, which had been *Symbolically* offered to Him[q]. He incurs the juſt *Judgment* of God, for

[o] 1 *Cor.* XI. 27, 29.

[p] Credentibus fit *corpus vivificum*, quia illi panis Cœleſtis & Corporis Chriſti vere ſunt *participes:* Aliis vero tam non recipientibus quam non credentibus licet *Antitypon* ſit, tamen illis nequaquam eſt, nec fit *corpus* Chriſti. *Coſin.* Hiſtor. Eccl. p. 69.

[q] Non idcirco vocat Paulus *reos* quod ipſum Corpus Chriſti *ederint*, neque idcirco Illi judicium ſibi accerſunt quod *ſumpſerint*, ſed quod *ſumere* Corpus Domini neglexerint. *Lamb. Danæus* Apolog. pro *Helvet.* Eccl. p. 30. alias 1479.

N. B. This Account is right as to *Fact*, that the unworthy *do not receive* the *Body*, but as to *Guilt* in approaching the Holy Table, it is inſufficient; becauſe, by this Account, there would

CHAP. VII.

for *not diſcerning*, that is, *not eſteeming*, not *reverencing*, not *receiving* [r] the Lord's Body when He might, and when both Duty and Intereſt required his moſt grateful and moſt devout Acceptance. Nay farther, He is guilty of contemning the *Blood of the Covenant*, and the *Author* of our Salvation, by ſo *profane* an uſe of what ſo nearly concerns Both. This muſt be ſo, in the very Nature of the Thing, if we ſuppoſe (as we here do) that the Sacramental Symbols are *interpretatively*, or in *juſt Conſtruction*, by Divine Appointment, the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt. But this Point alſo muſt be more minutely conſidered in its proper Place.

5. I PROCEED, in the laſt Place, to examine the Sentiments of the *Ancients* on this Head: And if They fall in with the Account here given, we can then want nothing to ſet this Matter in the cleareſt Light, or to fix it beyond all reaſonable diſpute.

A. D. 107. *Ignatius.*

Ignatius, occaſionally reflecting on ſome Perſons who rejected the uſe of the Euchariſt, de-

be no difference between *abſenting*, and *unworthy* receiving; both being equally a *Neglect* of the ſame Thing. There muſt be more in *unworthy* Reception: It is not merely neglecting the *inward Grace*, but it is *profaning* alſo the *outward Means*.

[r] The Wicked receive the *Signs* of the Lord's Body and Blood, not the *Body* and *Blood*; that is, not the Thing ſignified. So the *Fathers* diſtinguiſh commonly on this Head. The Teſtimonies of *Origen*, *Ambroſe*, *Jerome*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Auſtin*, and others may be ſeen collected and explained in *Albertinus*, p. 549, 586. Sometimes the Fathers do indeed ſpeak leſs accurately, of the *unworthy* receiving the *Body* and *Blood*, meaning the outward *Symbols*, giving the Name of the *Thing* ſignified to the *Signs*, by a Metonymy. Compare *Moreton*, p. 320.

livers

livers his Mind as here follows: " They ab- CHAP.
" ſtain from the *Euchariſt* and *Prayer*, becauſe VII.
" They admit not the Euchariſt to be the *Fleſh*
" *of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* which *ſuffered* for
" our Sins, and which the Father of his Good-
" neſs *raiſed* from the Dead: They therefore
" thus gainſaying the *Gift of God*, die in their
" Diſputes[s]." It is to be noted, that Thoſe Miſbelievers (probably the old *Viſionaries*, in Greek *Docetæ*) did not allow that our Lord had any *real* Fleſh or Blood, conceiving that his *Birth*, *Paſſion*, and *Reſurrection* were all imaginary, were mere *Show* and *Appearance*. Thereupon They rejected the *Euchariſt* and the *Prayers* thereto belonging, as founded in the Doctrine of our Lord's *real Humanity*. Now, *Ignatius* here intimates, that the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, are in juſt Conſtruction, the *Body*, or *Fleſh* and *Blood* of Chriſt as *dying*, and as *raiſed* again: Therefore He bore about Him a *real* Body. The Euchariſt being *repreſentative*, and alſo interpretatively *exhibitive* of ſuch *real* Fleſh and Blood, was itſelf a ſtanding Memorial of the *Truth* of the Church's Doctrine concerning our Lord's *real* Humanity. *Ignatius* could not imagine that the Symbols were *literally* Fleſh and Blood; no one was then weak enough to entertain ſo

[s] Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν· οἱ οὖν ἀντιλέγοντες τῇ δωρεᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, συζητοῦντες ἀποθνήσκουσι. *Ignat.* ad Smyrn. c. VII. Vid. *Albertin*, p. 286, &c.

CHAP. VII.

wild a Thought: But if they were *conſtructionally*, or *interpretatively* ſo, it was ſufficient, being all that his Argument required. The Euchariſt, ſo underſtood, *ſuppoſed* a real Body of Fleſh and Blood belonging to our bleſſed Lord, both as *dying* and *riſing again:* For, without that Suppoſition, the Euchariſt was no Euchariſt at all, a Repreſentation of nothing, or a falſe Repreſentation [t]; and that the Misbelievers themſelves were very ſenſible of, and therefore abſtained from it. I may further obſerve, that *Ignatius* here ſuppoſes not, with the *Conſubſtantiators*, a natural Body of Chriſt *locally preſent*, and a Sacramental one beſides; but it is all one *Symbolical* Body in the Euchariſt, ſupplying the Place of the natural, in real *Effect*, and to all *ſaving* Purpoſes. The Euchariſt, that is, the Bread and Wine, *is* (conſtructionally) *the Fleſh of Jeſus*, &c. It is not ſaid, that it is *with* the Fleſh, or that one is *in*, *with*, or *under* the other: So that Mr. *Pfaffius* had no occaſion to triumph here [u].

[t] *Chryſoſtom*'s Reaſoning, in like Caſe, is here very appoſite, in Matt. Hom. 53. p 783. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ιησῆς, τίνος σύμβολα τὰ τελούμενα; *If Jeſus did not really die, what are the Euchariſtical Elements Symbols of?* N. B. The Argument did not require or ſuppoſe a *corporal Preſence:* A *Symbolical* one was ſufficient to confute the Gainſayers, if *Chryſoſtom* had any Judgment. Conf. Pſeud-*Origen. Dialog. contr. Marcion.* p. 853.

[u] *Pfaffius* (p. 263.) appears to triumph over *Albertinus*, with reſpect to this Paſſage of *Ignatius:* But *Albertinus* had very *juſtly* explained it, and defended his Explication, with great Learning, and ſolid Judgment, beyond all reaſonable Diſpute; as every impartial Reader will find, who will but be at the Pains to look into Him, p. 286, &c.

THAT

THAT *Ignatius* admitted of *real* and *beneficial* Effects, will be plain from another Paſſage. CHAP. VII.

" — Breaking one Bread, which is the *Medi-*
" *cine of Immortality*, a *Preſervative* that we
" ſhould not die, but ſhould live for ever in
" Jeſus Chriſt [w]. In what Senſe He underſtood the Thing ſo to be, will appear more fully when we come to other *Fathers*, ſomewhat later in the ſame Century. There is one Place more of this Apoſtolical Writer, worth the reciting. " The Fleſh of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt
" is but one, and the Cup one unto the *Unity*
" *of his Blood* [x]. He alluded, probably, to 1 *Cor.* X. 16. *Communion of the Blood of Chriſt*, and ſo the Meaning is, for the *uniting* us to Chriſt, firſt, and then in and through Him, to one another, his *one Blood* being the Cement which binds Head and Members all together.

A. D. 140. *Juſtin Martyr.*

Juſtin, another early Chriſtian Teacher and Martyr, comes next: I ſhall cite as much from Him as may ſuffice to clear the Point in Hand. " This Food we call the Euchariſt: Which
" no one is allowed to partake of, but He

[w] Ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅς ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, διὰ παντός. *Ignat.* ad Epheſ. c. XX. This was no *Flight*, but the ſtanding Doctrine of the Author, which He expreſſes without any *Figure* elſewhere. Epiſt. ad *Smyrn.* c. VII. συνέφερεν ἢ αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾶι, ἵνα καὶ ἀναζῶσιν. *It behoves them to celebrate the Feaſt of the Euchariſt* (ſo I underſtand ἀγαπᾶν, with *Cotelerius* in loc.) *that They may riſe* to Life.

[x] Μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. *Ignat.* ad Philad. c. IV.

" that

CHAP. VII.

" that believes our Doctrines to be true, and " who has been baptized in the Laver of Re- " generation for Remiſſion of Sins, and lives " up to what Chriſt has taught. For we take " not theſe as *common* Bread and *common* Drink: " But like as Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour, being " incarnate by *the Word* of God, bore about " Him both Fleſh and Blood for our Salvation; " ſo are we taught that this Food which is " bleſſed by the Prayer of *the Word* that came " from Him [God] and which is *changed* in- " to the Nouriſhment of our Fleſh and Blood, " is *the Fleſh and Blood of the incarnate Jeſus.* " For the Apoſtles in their Commentaries, " called the *Goſpels*, have left it upon Record, " that *Jeſus* ſo commanded them; for He *took* " *Bread*, and when He had given Thanks, He " ſaid, *Do this in Remembrance of me, This is* " *my Body:* In like manner alſo He took the " Cup, and when He had given Thanks, He " ſaid, *This is my Blood*[y]. Upon this Paſſage of *Juſtin*, may be obſerved as follows: 1. That He ſuppoſed the Elements to be *bleſſed* or ſanctified by virtue of the *Prayer* of the *Word*, or *Logos*, firſt made uſe of in the *Inſtitution*, and remaining in force to this Day, in ſuch a Senſe as I have explained above, in the Chapter of *Conſecration*. 2. That *Juſtin* alſo ſuppoſed the ſame Elements, after Conſecration, to continue ſtill *Bread* and *Wine*, only not *com-*

[y] *Juſtin Martyr.* Apol. I. p. 96, 97. Edit. Lond. See alſo above, Ch. 3. p. 80. where part of the ſame Paſſage is cited for another Purpoſe.

mon

mon Bread and Wine: For, while He ſays, it is not *common* Bread, He ſuppoſes it to be *Bread.* CHAP. VII.

3. That while He ſuppoſes the conſecrated Elements to be *changed* into our bodily *Nutriment*, He could not have a Thought of our Lord's *natural* Body's admitting ſuch a *Change.* 4. That nevertheleſs He does maintain that ſuch conſecrated Food is, in ſome Senſe or other, *The Fleſh and Blood of the incarnate Jeſus*; and He quotes the Words of the *Inſtitution* to prove it. 5. He ſuppoſes no other Fleſh and Blood *locally* preſent in the Euchariſt, but that very conſecrated Food which He ſpeaks of; for that is *The Fleſh and Blood.* Therefore He affords no colour for imagining *two Bodies*, natural and ſacramental, as *locally* preſent together, in the way of *Conſubſtantiation.* 6. It remains then, that He could mean nothing elſe but the *repreſentative* or *Symbolical* Body of Chriſt, anſwering to the *natural* (once upon the Croſs, and now in Heaven) as *Proxies* anſwer to their *Principals*, as Authentick *Copies*, or *Exemplifications* to their Originals, in Uſe, Value, and legal Effect. For, that *Juſtin* cannot be underſtood of a bare *Figure* or naked *Repreſentation*, appears from hence, that He ſuppoſes a *Divine* Power, the Power of the *Logos* Himſelf (which implies his *Spiritual* Preſence) to be neceſſary for making the Elements become ſuch Symbolical *Fleſh* and *Blood:* Whereas, if it were only a *Figure*, or *Repreſentation*, Men might eaſily make it themſelves by their *own* Power, and would need only the original

CHAP. VII.

Commiſſion to warrant their doing it. 7. Tho' *Juſtin* (addreſſing Himſelf to *Jews*, or *Pagans*) does not ſpeak ſo plainly of the great Chriſtian *Privileges*, or *Graces* conferred in the Euchariſt, as *Ignatius*, writing to *Chriſtians*, before Him did, yet He has tacitly inſinuated the ſame Things; as well by mentioning the previous *Qualifications* requiſite for it, as alſo by obſerving that the [Symbolical] *Fleſh* and *Blood* of Chriſt are *incorporate* with ours: From whence by juſt Inference all the reſt follows, as every Grace is implied in ſuch our interpretative *Union* with Chriſt *crucified*, or *glorified*. Beſides that our Author ſuppoſed, as I before noted, a real Spiritual Preſence of the *Divine* Nature of our Lord in, or with the Elements, to make them *effectually* the Body and Blood of Chriſt: And He carries it ſo high, as to draw a Compariſon from the *Preſence* of the *Logos* to our Lord's *Humanity*, whereof the Euchariſt is a kind of *Emblem*, tho' in a looſe general way, faint and imperfect[z]. Thus much however is *common* to Both: That there is a *Preſence* of the *Logos* with ſomething *corporeal*; a Preſence with ſomething conſidered as his *Body*; and a Preſence *operating* in conjunction with that Body for the *uniting* all his *true* Members together under Him their *Head*. But that ſuch *Compariſons* help to *clear* the Subject, is more than I will ſay; being ſenſible that they are far from *exact*, and may want *Diſtinctions*

[z] See the *Doctrinal Uſe of the Sacraments conſidered*, in a Charge p. 25.

to

to make them bear, or otherwiſe may be apt to *miſlead:* It is enough, if we can but come at the true and full Senſe of the Authors. CHAP. VII.

A. D. 176. *Irenæus.*

Irenæus's Doctrine of the Euchariſt, ſo far as concerns this preſent Chapter, may be underſtood from the Paſſages here following, together with ſome explanatory Remarks which I mean to add to them.

" How can they ſay that the Fleſh goes to " Corruption, and never more partakes of Life, " when it is fed with the Body of our Lord, " and with his Blood?——As the terreſtrial " Bread upon receiving the *Invocation* of God, " is no longer *common* Bread, but the *Euchariſt*, " conſiſting of two Things, *Terreſtrial*, and *Ce-* " *leſtial*; ſo alſo our Bodies, upon receiving the " Euchariſt, are no longer corruptible, having " an aſſurance of a *Reſurrection* to all Eternity [a]. " But if this Fleſh of ours has no Title to *Sal-* " *vation*, then neither did our Lord redeem us " with his own Blood, nor is the Cup of the " Euchariſt *The Communion* [Communication] " *of his Blood*, nor the Bread which we break, " *The Communion* [Communication] *of his Body.*

[a] Πῶς δὲ σάρκα λέγουσιν εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφομένην; —— ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος ἔκκλησιν [fortè ὄπικλησιν] τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἔτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἔστιν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶτὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα. *Irenæus.* L. IV. c. 18. p. 251. Ed. Bened.

" For

CHAP. VII. " For it is not *Blood*, if it is not of the *Veins* " and *Fleſh*, and whatever elſe makes up the " Subſtance of the Human Frame, ſuch as the " *Word* was really made [b]. A little after, the Author adds this large explanatory Paſſage, worth the noting. " The Creature of the *Cup* " He declared to be his own *Blood*, with which " He imbues our Blood; and the Creature of " *Bread* He affirmed to be his own Body, out " of which our Bodies grow up. When there- " fore the mingled Cup and the created Bread " receive *the Word of God*, and the Euchariſt be- " comes Chriſt's Body, and by theſe the Sub- " ſtance of our Fleſh grows and conſiſts, how " can They ſay, that the *Fleſh* is not capable " of the *Gift of God*, (namely *Life eternal*) when " it is fed with the Body and Blood of Chriſt, " and is Member of Him? To this Purpoſe " ſpeaks St. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, " that *we are Members of his Body, of his Fleſh,* " *and of his Bones*, Epheſ. V. 30. ——— The " Fleſh is nouriſhed by the Cup which is his " *Blood*, and is increaſed by the Bread which " is his *Body*. And like as a Branch of the " Vine put into the Ground, brings forth Fruit " in its Seaſon, and a Grain of wheat falling " into the Ground and there diſſolved, riſeth " again with manifeſt increaſe, by the Spirit

[b] Si autem non ſalvetur hæc [Caro] videlicet nec Dominus Sanguine ſuo redemit nos, neque *Calix* Euchariſtiæ *communicatio Sanguinis ejus eſt*, neque *Panis* quem frangimus, *Communicatio corporis ejus eſt*. Sanguis enim non eſt niſi a venis & carnibus, & a reliqua quæ ſecundum Hominem eſt ſubſtantia, qua verè factum eſt verbum Dei. *Iren.* L. V. c. 2. p. 293.

" of

" of God that containeth all Things; and thoſe CHAP.
" afterwards by Divine Wiſdom ſerve for the VII.
" uſe of Man, and receiving the *Logos* [Word]
" *of God*, become the Euchariſt, which is the
" Body and Blood of Chriſt: So alſo our Bo-
" dies being fed by it [*viz.* the Euchariſt] and
" laid in the Ground, and diſſolving there,
" ſhall yet ariſe in their Seaſon, by means of
" the *Divine Logos* vouchſafing them a Reſur-
" rection to the glory of God the Father [c].

FROM theſe ſeveral Paſſages thus laid together, I take the Liberty to obſerve: 1. That our Author had no Notion of the Elements being *changed*, upon Conſecration, into the *natural* Body of Chriſt; for He ſuppoſes them ſtill to remain as the *Earthly* Part, and to be converted into *bodily* Nutriment; which to affirm of our Lord's Body, *crucified* or *glorified*, would be infinitely abſurd [d]. 2. Neither does our Author at all favour the Notion of Chriſt's *natural* Body being literally and locally preſent *under* or *with* the Elements: For, the *Heavenly Thing* ſuppoſed to ſupervene [e] in the Conſecration, and to be *preſent*, is not Chriſt's natural Body, but the *Logos*, or *Divine Nature* of our

[c] *Irenæus*. L. V. p. 294.

[d] Compare a Fragment of *Irenæus*, p. 343. concerning *Blandina*; from which it is manifeſt that the Chriſtians deſpiſed the Pagans for imagining that Chriſt's Body and Blood were ſuppoſed to be *literally* eaten in the Euchariſt: They rejected the Thought with abhorrence.

[e] In like Manner, *Nazianzen* makes *Baptiſm* to conſiſt of two Things, *Water* and the *Spirit*; which anſwers to *Irenæus*'s *Earthly* and *Heavenly* Parts in the Euchariſt. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. XI. p. 641.

Lord,

CHAP. VII.

Lord, or the *Holy Spirit*. Or if he did ſuppoſe the *Heavenly Thing* to be Chriſt's *glorified* Body, yet even that amounts to no more than ſaying that our *myſtical Union* with his Body is made or ſtrengthened in the Euchariſt; not by any *local* Preſence of that Body, but as our *myſtical Union* with all the *true* Members is therein perfected, at whatever Diſtance they are: So that whether we interpret the *Heavenly Part* of the *Logos*, or of the *Body* of Chriſt, *Irenæus* will not be found to favour the *Lutheran* Notion of the *Preſence*. 3. But leaſt of all does he favour the *Figuriſts*, or *Memorialiſts*; for his Doctrine runs directly counter to them almoſt in every Line. He aſſerts over and over, that Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* are eaten and drank in the Euchariſt, and our Bodies thereby *fed*; and not only ſo, but *inſured* thereby for a happy *Reſurrection:* And the Reaſon He gives is, that our *Bodies* are thereby made or continued *Members* of Chriſt's *Body*, *Fleſh*, and *Bones:* And his Concluſion is built on this Principle, that *Members* follow the *Head*, or that the *Parts* go with the *Whole:* Which Reaſoning ſuppoſes that the ſacred *Symbols*, tho' not *literally*, are yet *interpretatively*, or *conſtructionally*, the Body and Blood [f]. 4. To make the Symbols anſwer

[f] *N. B.* The *Lutherans* know not how to allow, in their way, that our Bodies are ſo *fed* with the *Lord's Body*, which they ſuppoſe to be *locally* preſent; or that any *Feeding* is a Pledge of a *happy* Reſurrection, ſince they ſuppoſe the Feeding *common* both to *good* and *bad*. Hence it is, that they can make no Senſe of *Irenæus*'s Argument. See *Pfaffius*, p. 72, 73, 84, 85, 104. *Deylingius* Obſerv. Miſcellan. p. 75, 76.

They

anſwer in ſuch View, He ſuppoſes the concurrence of a *Divine* Power to ſecure the Effect, a *Spiritual* Preſence of the *Logos*. 5. One Thing only, I conceive, our Author to be inaccurate in, (tho' perhaps more in Expreſſion, than real Meaning) in ſuperinducing the *Logos* upon the *Symbols* themſelves, rather than upon the *Recipients*, which would have been better. But in a popular way of ſpeaking, and with reſpect to the main Thing, they may amount to the ſame: And it was not needful to diſtinguiſh *critically* about a Mode of Speech, while there was no Suſpicion of wrong Notions being grafted upon it, as hath ſince happened. 6. Laſtly, I may note, that theſe larger Paſſages of *Irenæus* may ſerve as good Comments upon the ſhorter ones of *Ignatius* before cited: And ſo *Ignatius* may lend Antiquity to *Irenæus*'s Sentiments, while *Irenæus*'s add Light and Strength to his. CHAP. VII.

A. D. 192. *Clemens of Alexandria.*

THIS *Clemens* was a Perſon of infinite Read-

They might perceive, if they pleaſed, from this plain Mark, that their Scheme has a *Flaw* in it, and cannot ſtand. The Miſtake is owing to the want of conſidering the Nature of *Symbolical* Language, and *Symbolical* Grants. Our Bodies are not *literally*, but *Symbolically* fed with our Lord's Body; which in *Effect* is tantamount: There lies the whole Myſtery of the Matter; and thereupon hangs *Irenæus*'s Argument. *Good* Men are *conſidered* in that Action, as *ſo fed*; and it will be *imputed* to them, and *accepted* by God, as if it *literally* were ſo. *Deylingius* concludes, *however it be* (that is, tho' He can make *no* conſiſtent *Senſe* of his Author) yet *Irenæus* is clear for *real Preſence*. Not at all in the *Lutheran*, or the *Popiſh* Senſe; but only ſo far as *Symbolical* and *effectual* amount to *real*.

CHAP. VII.

ing, and of great Reputation in the Chriſtian Church. His Pieces are all of them *learned*, though not always ſo *clear* as might be wiſhed. In a very *full* Head, Ideas are often *crowded*, and have not *room* to be diſtinctly ranged. Our Author appears to have had elevated Sentiments of the Chriſtian Euchariſt, but ſuch as require cloſe Attention to ſee to the bottom of. He writes thus.

" THE Blood of the Lord is two-fold, the " *carnal* by which we are redeemed from Cor- " ruption, and the *ſpiritual* by which we are " anointed: To drink the Blood of Jeſus, is " to partake of our Lord's Immortality. More- " over, the Power of the *Word* is the *Spirit*, " as *Blood* is of the *Fleſh*. And correſpondent- " ly, as *Wine* is mingled with *Water*, ſo is the " *Spirit* with the *Man:* And as the mingled " Cup goes for *Drink*, ſo the *Spirit* leads to " *Immortality*. Again, the mixture of theſe " two, *viz.* of the *Drink* and of the *Logos* toge- " ther, is called the *Euchariſt*, *viz.* glorious " and excellent *Grace*, whereof thoſe who par- " take in Faith, are *ſanctified*, both Body and " Soul. The Father's Appointment myſtically " tempers *Man*, a *Divine* Mixture, with the " *Spirit* and the *Logos:* For, in very deed, the " *Spirit* joins Himſelf with the *Soul* as ſuſtain- " ed by Him, and the *Logos* with the *Fleſh*, for " which the *Logos became Fleſh*[g]. What I have to

[g] Διπλῆ ἡ τὸ αἷμα τῦ κυρίε· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὄτιν αὐτῇ σαρκικὸν ᾧ ἐ φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν, τετέτιν ᾧ κεχρίσμεθα· ἡ μὲν τοίνυν ὄτιν πιεῖν τὸ αἷμα τῦ Ἰησῦ, ἐ κυριακῆς μεταλαβεῖν ἀφθαρσίας.

to obſerve of theſe Lines of *Clemens*, may be comprized in the Particulars here following. CHAP. VII.

1. THE firſt Thing to be taken notice of, is the *two-fold* Blood of Chriſt: By which *Clemens* underſtands the *natural* Blood ſhed upon the Croſs, and the *ſpiritual* Blood exhibited in the Euchariſt, namely, *ſpiritual* Graces, the Unction of the *Holy Spirit*, and Union with the *Logos*, together with what is conſequent thereupon. As to parallel Places of the *Fathers*, who ſpeak of the *Anointing*, in the Euchariſt, with the *Blood* of Chriſt thro' the *Spirit*, the Reader may conſult Mr. *Aubertine*[h]; or Bp. *Fell* in his Notes upon *Cyprian*[i]. St. *Jerome* ſeems to have uſed the like Diſtinction with *Clemens* between the *natural* and *ſpiritual* Body and Blood of Chriſt[k]. If we would take in all the ſeveral Kinds of our *Lord's Body*, or

σίας. Ἰχὼς ὃ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς αἷμα σαρκός. Ἀναλόγως τοίνυν χίρναται, ὁ μὲν οἶν & τῷ ὕδατι πῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ πνεῦμα. Καὶ τὸ μὲν εἰς πίστιν [leg. πίσιν] ἐνωχεῖ, τὸ χρᾶμα· τὸ δὲ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ὁδήγει, τὸ πνεῦμα· ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν αὖ δὶς κρᾶσις, πιστῷ τε καὶ λόγῳ, εὐχαριστία κέκληται, χάρις ἐπαινουμένη καὶ καλή· ἧς οἱ κατ' πίστιν μεταλαμβάνοντες, ἁγιάζονται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν· τὸ θεῖον χρᾶμα, τὸ ἄνθρωπον, τῷ παιδικῷ βουλήματι & πνεύματι καὶ λόγῳ συγκίρναντι & μυστικῶς· καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς μὲν τὸ πνεῦμα φυσιοῦται τῇ ἀπ' ἀειπαθοῦς φερομένῃ ψυχῇ· ἡ δὲ σὰρξ, τῷ λόγῳ· δι' ἣν ὁ λόγος σὰρξ. *Clem. Alex.* Pædag. Lib. II. c. 2. p. 177, 178.

Compare *Johnſon*. Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 188.

[h] *Albertinus* de Euchariſtia, p. 380.

[i] *Cyprian*. Ep. LXX. p. 190. Note that the Words in that Edition are, *Euchariſtia eſt unde baptizati unguntur, oleum in Altari Sanctificatum*. But in the Benedictine Edition, p. 125. the latter Part is corrected into *Oleo in Altari Sanctificato*.

[k] Dupliciter vero Sanguis Chriſti & Caro intelligitur: vel *Spiritualis* illa atque divina, de qua ipſe dixit Joh. VI. 54, 56; vel Caro, & Sanguis, quæ *crucifixa* eſt, & qui militis effuſus eſt lancea. *Hieronym.* in Eph. c. 1. p. 328.

CHAP. VII.

all the Notions that have gone under that Name, they amount to theſe Four. 1. His *natural* Body conſidered firſt as mortal, and next as immortal. 2. His *typical*, or *ſymbolical* Body, *viz.* the outward *Sign* in the Euchariſt. 3. His *ſpiritual* Body, in or out of the Euchariſt, *viz.* the *Thing ſignified*. 4. His *myſtical* Body, that is, his *Church*. But I proceed.

2. THE next Obſervation to be made upon *Clemens*, is, that He manifeſtly excludes the *natural* Body of Chriſt from being literally or locally *preſent* in the Sacrament, admitting only the *ſpiritual*; which He interprets of the *Logos* and of the *Holy Spirit*, one conceived more particularly to ſanctify the *Body*, and the other the *Soul*, and both inhabiting the regenerate Man. Which *general* Doctrine, abſtracting from the Caſe of the Euchariſt, is founded in *expreſs Scripture*[1], and may by juſt and clear Conſequence be applied to the *Euchariſt*, in virtue of the Words of the *Inſtitution*, and of *John* VI, and other Texts, beſides the plain Nature and Reaſon of the Thing.

3. ANOTHER Thing to be obſerved of *Clemens*, is, that as He plainly rejects any corporal and local Preſence, ſo does He as plainly reject the low Notions of the *Figuriſts*, or *Memorialiſts*: For, no Man ever expreſſed Himſelf more ſtrongly in favour of *ſpiritual Graces* convey'd in the Euchariſt.

4. IT may be farther noted, which ſhews

[1] *John* XIV. 16, 17, 23. 1 *Cor.* III. 16, 17. VI. 19. 2 *Cor.* VI. 16.

our

our Author's Care and Accuracy, that he brings not the *Logos* and *Holy Spirit* ſo much upon the *Elements*, as upon the *Perſons*, viz. the worthy Receivers, to ſanctify them both in Body and Soul. He does indeed ſpeak of the mixture of the *Wine* and the *Logos*; and if He is to be underſtood of the *perſonal*, and not *vocal*, Word, He then ſuppoſes the Euchariſt to conſiſt of two Things, *Earthly* and *Heavenly*, juſt as *Irenæus* before Him did: But even upon that Suppoſition, He might really mean no more than that the *Communicant* received both together, both at the ſame Inſtant. They were only ſo far *mixed*, as being both adminiſtred at the *ſame Time*, and to the *ſame Perſon*, receiving the one with his *Mouth*, and the other with his *Mind*, ſtrengthened at once both in *Body* and in *Soul*[m]. *Clemens*, in another Place, cites part of the *Inſtitution*, by memory perhaps, as follows: " He bleſſed the Wine, ſaying; *Take*, " *drink*, *This is my Blood.* This Blood of the " Grape myſtically ſignifies the *Word* pour- " ed forth for many, for the Remiſſion of " Sins, that Holy Torrent of Gladneſs[n]. Three CHAP. VII.

[m] Signum ſignatumque *conjunctim* conſiderantur, tanquam *unum aggregatum*, idque ob *conjunctam* amborum *exhibitionem & participationem* in uſu legitimo. Quam conjunctionem vulgo vocant *Unionem Sacramentalem*, ſed non uſque adeo convenienter; cum non *ſignatum* cum *ſigno*, ſed *nobiſcum* uniatur, eoque potius, minùs ſaltem ambiguè, *conjunctio Pacti* debeat nominari. —— *Voſſius* de Sacram. vi & effic. p. 250. Conf. *Bucer.* Script. Anglican. p. 544.

[n] Καὶ ἐυλόγησέν γε τ οἶνον, εἰπὼν, λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ὄζιν τὸ αἷμα. Αἷμα δ ἀμπέλου τ λόγον τ ἀεὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐυφροσυνης ἅγιον ἀλληγορεῖ ποτόν. Clem. Pædag. L. 2. c. 2. p. 186. I have altered the common *Pointing*, for the improving the Senſe.

CHAP. VII. Things are obſervable from this Paſſage: One, that the Wine of the Euchariſt, after Conſecration, is ſtill the *Blood of the Grape:* Another, that it is called the Blood of Chriſt, or Blood of the *Logos* (as *Origen* alſo [o] ſtyles it) *ſymbolically* ſignifying and exhibiting the Fruits of the *Paſſion.* Laſtly, that thoſe Fruits are owing to the Union of the *Logos* with the ſuffering Humanity. Theſe Principles all naturally fall in with the Accounts I have before given.

A. D. 200. *Tertullian.*

THE Sentiments of the *African* Chriſtians, in thoſe early Days, may be probably judged of by *Tertullian*, a very learned and acute Writer, who thus expreſſes them. "*Bread* is the "*Word* of the living God, which came down "from Heaven; beſides that his *Body* alſo is "*underſtood* in Bread: *This is my Body.* There- "fore in aſking our *daily Bread*, we aſk "for *Perpetuity* in Chriſt, and to be *undivided* "from his Body [p]. Here our Author teaches, that the *Divine* Nature of our Lord is our *Bread*, and likewiſe that his *Human* Nature is our *Bread* alſo, given us in, or under the Symbol of the Sacramental Bread. So *Rigaltius* [q] interprets

[o] *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. IX. p. 243. See above p. 83. And compare *Cyrill. Alexandr.* contr. Neſtor. L. V. p. 123.

[p] Panis eſt *Sermo Dei vivi*, qui deſcendit de Cœlis. Tum quod & corpus ejus in Pane cenſetur: *Hoc eſt Corpus meum.* Itaque petendo *Panem quotidianum*, Perpetuitatem poſtulamus in Chriſto, & Individuitatem a corpore ejus. *Tertullian.* de Orat. c. VI. p. 131, 132.

[q] Sic videtur explicari poſſe: Per Panis Sacramentum commendat

interprets the Paſſage, quoting a ſimilar Paſſage of St. *Auſtin:* But the Reader may compare *Albertinus*[r]. We can allow the *Romaniſts* here to underſtand Chriſt's *real* and *natural* Body given in the Sacrament, but *myſtically*, *ſpiritually* and *interpretatively* given; as a *Right* may be given us to a *diſtant* Poſſeſſion. *Tertullian* ſeems to underſtand *Body*, of the Body *glorified*, becauſe He ſpeaks of our being *undivided* from it, and may beſt be explained of the *myſtical Union* between Chriſt and his Members, perfected in this Sacrament: Which kind of Union, as I have more than once hinted, ſuppoſes no *local* corporal *Preſence*, nor infers any.

CHAP. VII.

Tertullian elſewhere ſpeaks of our Bodies as being fed with the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, that our *Souls* may be *feaſted with God*, or may *feed upon God*[s]. There I underſtand *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt of the *Sacramental*, *Symbolical* Body and Blood, that is, of the *Bread* and *Wine*, which *literally* nouriſh the *Body* of Man, and *Symbolically* the Soul. *Signs* often bear the Names of the *Things ſignified*, as *Tertullian* more than once intimates with reference to this very Caſe[t].

mendat Corpus ſuum: Quemadmodum *Auguſtinus* L. I. Quæſt. Evang. 43. dixit, *Per vini Sacramentum commendat Sanguinem ſuum.* Rigalt. in loc.

[r] *Albertinus* de Euchariſt. p. 344. He underſtands it thus: That Bread is a *Name* for the Sacramental *Body*, as well as for *common Bread*, and for *Spiritual* Food, *i. e.* Chriſt Himſelf.

[s] Caro Corpore & Sanguine Chriſti veſcitur, ut & anima de Deo ſaginetur: Non poſſunt ergo ſeparari in mercede, quas opera conjungit. *Tertul.* de Reſur. Carn. c. VIII. p. 330. conf. *Albertin.* p. 340.

[t] Panem *corpus ſuum* appellans. *Tertull.* adv. Jud. c. X. p. 196. contr. Mar. l. 3. c. 19. p. 408.

CHAP. VII.

And when He ſays, that Chriſt *made the Bread his own Body* [u], He muſt be underſtood of the *Symbolical* Body, (the *Figure*, or *Symbol* of the natural Body,) repreſenting [w] and exhibiting the Thing ſignified.

BUT I muſt obſerve farther, that when *Tertullian* builds an Argument for the *Reſurrection* of the Body upon this Conſideration, that our *Bodies* are fed with the *Symbolical* Body of Chriſt (as I have explain'd it) He cannot be underſtood to mean leſs than that the Symbolical Body is *conſtructionally*, or *interpretatively* the real Body; and ſo our Bodies are *literally* fed with one, while *myſtically* and *Spiritually* fed with the other alſo. Without this Suppoſition, there is no Force at all in his Argument for the *Reſurrection*. Our Bodies are *conſidered* as *fed* with Chriſt's natural Body, therefore they are conſidered as *pertaining* to, or *mingled* with his Body; therefore they are in Conſtruction *one Fleſh* with Him; therefore, as his Body is *glorified*, ſo alſo will *ours* be, Head and Members together. Such is the Tour of the Argument, ſuch the Chain of Ideas that forms it [x]. Which is confirm'd by what He adds, *viz.* that *Soul* and *Body* being Partners in the *Work*, will ſhare alſo in the *Reward*. What is the *Work?* The

[u] Acceptum Panem & diſtributum Diſcipulis *corpus illum ſuum fecit*, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM dicendo: Id eſt, figura Corporis mei. Contr. Marc. L. IV. c. 40. p. 458.

[w] Panem, quo ipſum corpus ſuum *repræſentat*. Contr. Marc. L. I.

[x] A Collection of other ancient Teſtimonies, ſo far as concerns that *Argument*, may be ſeen in *Johnſon*. (Unbl. Sacr. Part 2. p. 110, &c.) tho' He does not account for it in the ſame way.

Work

Work of *feeding* upon Chriſt: Both feaſt together here upon the *ſame Lord*, therefore both ſhall enjoy the ſame Lord hereafter. Which Inference implies that even our *Bodies* are in ſome Senſe, (namely in the *myſtical* and *conſtructional* Senſe) fed with our Lord's natural Body, as *crucified*, or as *glorified*. Enough has been ſaid, to give the Reader a competent Notion of *Tertullian*'s Doctrine on this Head. I ſhall only take notice further, that the acute and learned *Pfaffius*, following the *Lutheran* Hypotheſis, has collected many Teſtimonies ſeemingly *favouring* that Side, but then, very ingenuouſly, has matched them with *others* which are directly *repugnant* to it; and He has left them facing each other[y], unreconciled, irreconcilable. How eaſily might all have been ſet right, had He but conſidered a very common Thing, called *Conſtruction of Law*, or duly attended to the *Symbolical* Language, which *Scripture* and *Fathers* abound in? To what Purpoſe is it to cite *Fathers* in any Cauſe, without *reconciling* the Evidence? Self-contradictory Evidence is *null* or *none*. But I proceed. CHAP. VII.

A. D. 240. *Origen.*

Bulinger, in his Treatiſe againſt *Caſaubon*, cites a Paſſage as *Origen*'s, which runs thus: "He "that partakes of the *Bread*, partakes alſo of "the *Lord's Body*: For, we look not to the "Objects of Senſe lying before us, but we lift

[y] Vid. *Pfaffius* de Conſecrat. Vet. Euchar. p. 465, 470, 471.

"up

"up the Soul by Faith to the Body of the *Lo-*
"*gos*. For, He ſaid not, *This is the Symbol*,
"but *This is Body*; to prevent any one's think-
"ing that it was a Type[z]. *Albertinus* throws off this Paſſage as ſpurious, and as the Product of ſome modern Greek[a]. *Huetius* comes after, and blames Him for arbitrarily *cutting* the Knot[b], as He ſuppoſes. But there would be no great difficulty in *untying* the Knot, were it certain that the Words are *Origen*'s. I will ſuppoſe that they are; and indeed I ſee no good Reaſon why they may not. He ſeems to have intended nothing more but to raiſe up *vulgar* Minds from groveling Apprehenſions, to Heavenly Contemplations. Such Exhortations to the Populace are frequent in other *Fathers*. *Origen* admits not of naked *Signs*, or mere *Figures:* He was no *Sacramentarian*. He thought, very rightly, that the Words of the *Inſtitution* were too ſtrong and emphatical to ſubmit to ſo low a Meaning. He conceived that, under the *Symbolical* Body, was to be underſtood the *natural* Body of Chriſt, the Body of the *Logos*. If we take in another Paſſage of *Origen*'s, out of one of his *Homilies*[c], and joyn it with

[z] Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος μετέχων, τοῦ σώματος κυρίου μεταλαμβάνει· ὁ γὰρ προσέχομεν τῇ φύσει τῶν αἰσθητῶν προκειμένων, ἀλλ' ἀνάγομεν τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ πίστεως ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου σῶμα. ὁ γὰρ εἶπε, τοῦτό ἐστι σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστι σῶμα· δεικτικῶς, ἵνα μὴ νομίζῃ τὶς τύπον εἶναι. *Buling.* contr. Caſaub. p. 617.

[a] *Albertin.* de Euchariſt. L. II. c. 3. p. 367.

[b] *Huetii* Origeniana, p. 182.

[c] Non hæreas in *Sanguine Carnis*, ſed diſce potiùs *Sanguinem Verbi* &c. *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. IX. p. 243.

this,

this, there will then appear a threefold, elegant gradation in his whole Account, as thus: Look not to the *typical* Body, but raiſe your Minds higher up to the *natural* Fleſh of Chriſt: Yea and ſtop not there, but aſcend ſtill higher, from *Human* to *Divine*, conceiving that *Fleſh* as perſonally united with the *divine* Logos, or as the *Body* of God. All which is true and ſound Doctrine, and very proper Subject-Matter for Chriſtian Exhortations: I need not add, that the whole is extremely ſuitable to what I have been maintaining all along in this Chapter.

A. D. 250. *Cyprian.*

IT is frequent with *Cyprian* to ſpeak of the *ſacred* Elements under the Name of our *Lord's Body* and *Blood*. I need not cite Paſſages to prove what no one who has ever looked into that Author can doubt of: In what Senſe He ſo ſtyled them, purſuant to the Words of the *Inſtitution*, is the ſingle Queſtion. He ſays, in a certain Place, that our Lord, in the original Euchariſt, *offered up Bread and Wine*, viz. *his own Body and Blood*[d]. It is plain, that He thought not of *Tranſubſtantiation*, ſince He calls the Elements *Bread* and *Wine*, even after Conſecration, and ſuppoſes beſides, that Chriſt offered the ſame in Subſtance that *Melchizedech* had

[d] Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod *Melchiſedech* obtulerat, id eſt, *Panem & Vinum*, ſuum ſcilicet *Corpus & Sanguinem*. Cypr. Epiſt. LXIII. p. 105. Ed. Bened. alias p. 149.

offered

CHAP. VII.

offered long before the Incarnation. Neither could *Cyprian* think of *Conſubſtantiation*, ſince He admits of no other *Body* and *Blood* as there preſent, and literally offered, but the ſame individual *Bread* and *Wine:* They were the *Body* and *Blood.* But how were they ſuch, ſince they were not ſo, ſtrictly, and literally? I anſwer, they were *figuratively* ſuch, according to our Author: Not that the Elements were by Him ſuppoſed to be mere *Figures*, or *Memorials*, or *Repreſentations*; but what they repreſented, that they repreſented with *Effect*, and ſo amounted in juſt *Conſtruction*, and *beneficial* Influence to the ſame Thing. This was the Notion he had of them, as will ſufficiently appear from ſeveral clear Paſſages. He ſuppoſes the *natural* Blood of Chriſt by which we are redeemed, to *be in the Cup*, in ſome Senſe or other, when the *ſacred Wine* is there[e]: The Wine *repreſents* it, ſtands for it, and is *interpretatively* the ſame Thing. He could not well mean leſs than this, by ſaying, that the Blood is *ſignified (oſtenditur)* in the Wine, and that it is ſuppoſed to be in the Cup, *videtur eſſe in calice*, is *looked* upon as being there. Not literally to be ſure, but conſtructionally, and in Effect: For, the *Effects*, according to Him, upon every faithful Receiver, are *Remiſſion of Sins*[f], and

[e] Nec poteſt videri *Sanguis* ejus, quo redempti & vivificati ſumus, *eſſe in calice* quando vinum deſit calici, quo Chriſti Sanguis oſtenditur, qui Scripturarum omnium Sacramento ac Teſtimonio prædicatur. *Ep.* 63. p. 104.

[f] Epotato Sanguine Domini & poculo ſalutari, exponatur memoria veteris Hominis, & fiat oblivio converſationis priſtinæ ſæcularis,

and *Spiritual Strength* againſt the Adverſary[g], and *Life Eternal*[h]. So far was He from the low and degrading Notions of the *Figuriſts* in this Article; and yet ſufficiently guarded (as I have before hinted) againſt another Extreme. CHAP. VII.

THERE are no more conſiderable Authorities to be met with, ſo far as concerns this Article, till we come down to the *Fourth* Century, and ſo on; and there they are innumerable: All following the ſame Tenor of Doctrine, all, when rightly underſtood, teaching the ſame Thing, in the main, with what I have here repreſented from their Predeceſſors; ſo that I know not whether it might not be tedious to my Readers, to proceed any farther in a recital of this Kind. But I may ſingle out one, as it were by way of Specimen, leaving the reſt to be judged of by That: And that one may be *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, as proper a Sample perhaps as any.

A. D. 348. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem.*

I DO not know any one Writer, among the Ancients, who has given a *fuller*, or *clearer*, or in the main *juſter* Account of the Ho-

cularis, & mæſtum pectus & triſte, quod priùs *peccatis* angentibus premebatur, *Divinæ Indulgentiæ* lætitia reſolvatur. *Cypr. ibid.* Ep. 63. p. 107. alias 153.

[g] Protectione Sanguinis & Corporis Chriſti muniamus; & cum ad hoc fiat Euchariſtia, ut poſſit accipientibus eſſe Tutela, quos tutos eſſe contra Adverſarium volumus, munimento Dominicæ ſaturitatis armemus. *Epiſt.* 54. p. 77. Alias *Ep.* 57. p. 117.

[h] Manifeſtum eſt eos *vivere* qui Corpus ejus attingunt, & Euchariſtiam jure communicationis accipiunt. *Cyprian.* de Orat. p. 209, 210.

ly

CHAP. VII.

ly Eucharist, than this the elder *Cyril* has done; tho' He has often been strangely misconstrued by contending Parties. The true and ancient Notions of the Eucharist came now to be digested into somewhat of a more regular and accurate Form, and the Manner of speaking of it became, as it were, fixed and settled upon Rules of Art. *Cyril* expresses Himself thus: "Receive we [the Eucharist] with all fulness of "Faith, as the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ: For, "under the *Type* [or *Symbol*] of Bread, you have "his *Body* given you, and under the *Type* [*Sym-*"*bol*] of Wine, you receive his Blood; that so "partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, "you may become *Flesh of his Flesh*, and *Blood of* "*his Blood*. For, by this Means, we carry "Christ about us, in as much as his Body and "Blood is *distributed* into our *Members*: Thus "do we become, according to St. *Peter*, Parta-"kers of the *Divine Nature*[i]. The Doctrine here taught is, that in the Eucharist we receive, (not *literally*, but *Symbolically*) the *natural* Body and Blood of Christ; just as the Priests of old, in eating the Sacrifices, *Symbolically*, but *effectually*, ate up the Sins of the People, or as the faithful Israelites, in eating *Manna* and drinking of

[i] Μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας, ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ· ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου, δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα. ἵνα γένῃ, μεταλαβὼν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ, σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ. ἔτω γὰρ καὶ χριστοφόροι γινόμεθα, τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὰ μέλη διαδιδομένου μέλη. οὕτω, κατὰ τὸ μακάριον Πέτρον, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως γινόμεθα. *Cyrill. Hierosol.* Mystag. IV. Sect. 3. p. 320. Edit. Bened.

the

the *Rock*, effectually fed upon Chriſt. The *Symbolical* Body and Blood are here ſuppoſed by our Author, to ſupply the Place of the *natural*, and to be in *Conſtruction* and *beneficial* Effect (not *ſubſtantially*) the ſame Thing with it; and ſo He ſpeaks of our becoming by that means *one Fleſh*, and *one Blood* with Chriſt, meaning it in as high a Senſe, as all the Members of Chriſt are *one Body*, or as Man and Wife are *one Fleſh*. We *carry Chriſt* about us, as we are *myſtically* united to Him. His Body and Blood are *conſidered* as *intermingled* with ours[k], when the *Symbols* of them *really* and *ſtrictly* are ſo: For, the *Benefit* is compleatly the ſame; and God *accepts* of ſuch *Symbolical* Union, making it, to all *ſaving* Purpoſes and Intents, as effectual, as any the moſt *real* could be. *Cyril* never thought of any *Preſence* of Chriſt's *natural* Bo- CHAP. VII.

[k] *Chryſoſtom*, in like manner, ſpeaks of Chriſt's *intermingling* his Body with ours, in the Euchariſt; but explains it, at length, by the *myſtical Union* therein contracted, or perfected between Chriſt the *Head*, and us his *Members*.

——ἀνέμιξεν ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀνέφυσε τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἕν τι ὑπάρξωμεν, καθάπερ σῶμα κεφαλῇ συνημμένον. *Chryſoſt.* in Joh. Hom. 46. p. 272. conf. in Matt. Hom. 83. p. 788.

"To ſhew the fervour of his Affection towards us, He has "*mingled* Himſelf with us, and *diffuſed* his own Body into us, "that ſo we may become *one Thing*, as a *Body* joined with the "*Head*. Compare *Cyrill* of *Alexandria*. In Johann. p. 365, 862. De Sanct. Trin. p. 407. *Iſidor. Peluſ.* L. 3. Ep. 195. p. 333.

N. B. *Chryſoſtom* elſewhere ſpeaks as highly of *Baptiſm*, and of the *mingling* with our Lord's Body, in That Sacrament alſo. [In *Coloſſ. Hom.* VI. p. 201.] all which means nothing but the *myſtical Union*. *Chamier* has diſcuſſed this whole Matter at large, if the Reader deſires farther Satisfaction. De *Euchariſt.* L. XI. c. 8, 9. p. 633, &c.

dy

CHAP. VII.

dy and Blood in the Sacrament, excepting in *Myſtery* and *Figure*, (which He expreſſes by the Word *Type*) and in real *Benefits* and *Privileges*.

HE goes on to obſerve, that our Lord once told the Jews (*Joh.* VI. 54.) of *eating his Fleſh*, &c. And they not underſtanding that it was ſpoken *Spiritually*, [but taking the Thing literally] were offended at it, as if He had been perſwading them to *devour* his *Fleſh*[l]. Hence it appears farther, that our Author was no Friend to the groſs, literal Conſtruction. He proceeds as follows: "Under the New Teſta-"ment we have *Heavenly Bread*, and a *Cup of* "*Salvation*, ſanctifying both Body and Soul: "For, as *Bread* anſwers to *Body*, ſo the *Logos* "ſuits with the *Soul*[m]. This Thought may be compared with another of *Clemens* above, ſomewhat like, and ſomewhat different. But both agree in two main Points, that the Euchariſt *ſanctifies* the worthy Receiver both in Body and Soul, and that Chriſt is properly, *preſent*, in his *Divine* Nature. Wherefore *Cy-*

[l] Ἐκεῖνοι μὴ ἀκηκοότες πνευματικῶς τ̃ λεγομένων, σκανδαλισθέντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, νομίζοντες ὅτι ὄντι σαρκοφαγίαν αὐτὸς προτρέπεται. *Cyril.* ibid. p. 321.

Touttee, the Benedictine, here blames our learned *Milles* for rendring, *quæ Spiritualiter dicebantur, non intelligerent*, inſtead of *quæ dicebantur, Spiritualiter non intelligerent*. The Criticiſm appears too nice, making a *Diſtinction* without a *Difference*; for the Senſe is the ſame either way. The *Capernaites* were here cenſured for not *Spiritually* conſtruing what was *Spiritually* intended; for taking *literally*, what was meant *Spiritually*: Which is what either Tranſlation at length reſolves into.

[m] Ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ, ἄρτος ὑράνιος, καὶ ποτήριον σωτηρίας, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἁγιάζοντα· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος σώματι καταλληλος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ λόγος τῇ ψυχῇ ἁρμόδιος. *Cyril.* ibid. p. 321.

ril

ril had the more Reaſon for preſſing his Exhortation afterwards in high and lofty Terms: "Conſider them [the Elements] not as mere "*Bread* and *Wine*; for by our Lord's expreſs "Declaration, They are the *Body* and *Blood* of "Chriſt. And tho' your *Taſte* may ſuggeſt "*That* to you [*viz.* that they are *mere* Bread "and Wine] yet let your *Faith* keep you firm. "Judge not of the Thing by your *Taſte*, but "under a full Perſwaſion of *Faith*, be you "undoubtedly aſſured, that you are vouchſafed "the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt[n]. This He ſaid to draw off the Minds of his Audience from low and carnal Apprehenſions, that ſo they might view thoſe Myſteries with the Eye of *Faith*, and not merely with the Eye of *Senſe*; might look thro' the outward *Sign* to the inward Thing *ſignified*, and regale their *Spiritual Taſte* more than the *ſenſual*. This is what *Cyril* really meant: Tho' ſome Moderns, coming to read Him either with *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Conſubſtantiation* in their Heads, have a-

CHAP. VII.

[n] Μὴ πρόσεχε τῷ ὡς φιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, κατὰ δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλῃ, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις σε βεβαιούτω, μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνης τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως πληροφορεῖσθαι ἀνενδιάστως σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς. Ibid. 321.

N. B. The firſt *Nicene* Council (if we may credit *Gelaſius*) had Words to the ſame Effect with theſe of *Cyril:* Not with any intent to declare the *Nature* or *Subſtance* of the conſecrated Elements (which none could doubt of) but to engage the *Attention* to their appointed *uſe*, and to the *Graces* therein ſignified, and conveyed. Vid. *Gelaſ. Cyzicen.* Part. 2. Concil. Tom. I. p. 427. Ed. Hard. conf. *Albertin.* p. 384, &c. Bp. *Moreton* has largely explained it, B. IV. c. 11. §. 2. p. 302, &c.

CHAP. VII. muſed themſelves with odd Conſtructions of very innocent Words.

As to his exhorting his Audience, not to take the Elements for *mere* Bread and Wine, it is juſt ſuch another kind of Addreſs as He had before made to them, firſt in relation to the *Waters* of *Baptiſm*, and next with regard to the *Chriſm*. "Look not to this Laver, as "to *ordinary Water*, but (attend) to the *Grace* "conferred with the Water[o]. Would any ſenſible Man conclude from hence, that the *Water* was *tranſubſtantiated*, according to our Author, into ſome other Subſtance? Let us go on to what He ſays of the *Chriſm*. "Have a "care of ſuſpecting that this is *ordinary Oint-* "*ment* [or mere Ointment] For, like as the "Sacramental Bread, after the Invocation of "the Holy Spirit, is no more bare *Bread*, but "the *Body* of *Chriſt*, ſo alſo this holy Unguent "is no more bare Ointment, nor to be called "*common*, after the Invocation; but it is the "Grace of Chriſt and of the Holy Spirit, en- "dowed with ſpecial Energy by the Preſence "of his Godhead: And it is *Symbolically* ſpread "over the Forehead and other Parts of the Bo- "dy. So then the Body is anointed with the "viſible Unguent, but the Soul is ſanctified by "the enlivening Spirit[p].

I CITE

[o] Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ, πρόσεχε τῷ λυτρῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος δι δομένῃ χάριτι. *Cyrill.* Catech. 3. p. 40. Vid. *Albertin.* 429. conf. *Chryſoſtom.* in Matt. Hom. 83. p. 787.

[p] Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐκ

I CITE not this, as approving all that *Cyril* has here ſaid of the *Chriſm* (not ſtanding upon Scripture-Authority) but to give Light to what He has ſaid of the *Euchariſt*, which He compares with the other, while He ſuppoſes the Caſes parallel. He conceived the *Elements* in one Caſe, and the *Unguent* in the other, to be *exhibitive* Symbols of *Spiritual* Graces, inſtrumentally conveying what they repreſent. The Bread and Wine, according to his Doctrine, are *Symbolically* the Body and Blood: And by *Symbolically* He means the very ſame Thing which I have otherwiſe expreſſed by ſaying, that they are the Body and Blood in *juſt Conſtruction*, and *beneficial* Effect. What *Cyril* feared with reſpect to *Baptiſm*, and the *Euchariſt*, and the *Unction*, was, that many in low Life (coming perhaps from the *Plough*, the *Spade*, or the *Pale*) might be dull of Apprehenſion, and look no higher than to what they *ſaw*, *felt*, or *taſted*. Upon the like Suſpicion was grounded the ancient ſolemn Preface to the Communion-Service, called *Surſum Corda* by the Latins: Wherein the officiating Miniſter admoniſhed the Communicants to *lift up their Hearts*, and they made anſwer, *we lift them up unto the Lord*[q]. To CHAP. VII.

οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὅτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν· ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, παρουσίᾳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον. ὅπερ συμβολικῶς ὅτι μετώπου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σου χρίεται αἰσθητείων. καὶ τῷ φαινομένῳ μύρῳ τὸ σῶμα χρίεται, τῷ δὲ ἁγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ πνεύματι ἡ ψυχὴ ἁγιάζεται. Myſtag. 3. p. 317. conf. *Gregor. Nyſſen.* de Baptiſm. Tom. III. p. 369.

[q] Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας. Cyril. Myſtag. 5. p. 326. *Cyprian* de Orat.

CHAP. VII.

To make the Point we have been upon ſtill plainer, let *Cyril* be heard again, as He expreſſes the Thing in a ſucceeding Lecture. "You "hear the Pſalmiſt with divine Melody invi- "ting you to the Communion of the Holy "Myſteries, and ſaying, *Taſte and ſee how gra- "cious the Lord is.* Leave it not to the bodily "Palate to judge: No, but to *Faith* clear of "all doubting. For, the Taſters are not com- "manded to taſte *Bread* and *Wine*, but the *An- "titype* [Symbol] of the *Body* and *Blood* of "Chriſt[r]. Here our Author plainly owns the Elements to be *Types*, or *Symbols* (as He had done alſo before) and therefore not the *very Things* whereof they are Symbols; not *literally* and ſtrictly, but *interpretatively*, *myſtically*, and to all *ſaving* Purpoſes and Intents; which ſuffices[s]. It is no marvel, if Mr. *Touttee*[t] and other

Orat. Domin. p. 213. alias 152. conf. *Bingham.* B. XV. c. 3. §. 3. *Renaudot.* Liturg. Orient. Vol. I. p. 226.

[r] Ακέετε τῦ ψάλλοντος, μετὰ μέλυς θείυ προτρεπομένυ ὑμᾶς εἰς τ̀ κοινωνίαν τ̃ ἁγίων μυςηρίων, κ̀ λέγοντος, γεύσασθε κ̀ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηςὸς ὁ κύριος. μὴ τῷ λάρυγγι τῷ σωματικῷ ἐπιτρέπετε τὸ κριτικόν. ἐχὶ, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνενδοιάςῳ πίςει. γυμνοὶ γὰρ ἄρτυ κ̀ οἴνυ κελεύονται γεύσασθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀντιτύπυ σώματος κ̀ αἵματος τ̃ Χριςῦ. Myſtag. V. p. 331.

[s] *Deylingius* ſeems to wonder at Mr. *Aubertine* and Mr. *Claude* for under-commenting, as He conceives, with reſpect to *Cyril*: *Deyling. Obſerv. Miſcellan.* p. 157. But He attempts not to *confute* what they had ſaid: It was wiſer to forbear. The utmoſt that any one can juſtly make of the very ſtrongeſt Expreſſions in *Cyril*, can amount only to a *myſtical* Union of Chriſt's Body with the *faithful* Communicants, as *Members* of Him; which is ſuch an Union as St. *Paul* reſembles to That whereby Man and Wife are *one Fleſh*, (*Eph.* V. 30, 31.) and which undoubtedly is a *moral* Union, independent of *local* Preſence.

[t] *Touttee*, Diſſert. 3. prefixed to his new Edition of *Cyril.* c. IX. p. 204, &c. The Reader may compare *Albertinus* (p. 422.) who

ther *Romaniſts* interpret *Cyril* to quite another Purpoſe: But one may juſtly wonder how the learned and impartial Dr. *Grabe* ſhould conſtrue *Cyril* in that *groſs* Senſe, which He mentions under the Name of *Augmentation*[u]. I preſume, He read *Cyril* with an Eye to modern *Controverſy*, and did not conſider Him as ſpeaking to *Mechanicks*, and *Day-Labourers:* Or, He was not aware of the *Difference* there is, between telling Men what they are to *believe*, and what they ought to *attend* to, which was *Cyril*'s chief Aim. As to *believing*, He very well knew that every one would believe his *Senſes*, and take Bread to be *Bread*, and Wine to be *Wine*, as Himſelf believed alſo: But He was afraid of their *attending* ſo intirely to the Report of their *Senſes*, as to forget the Reports of *ſacred Writ*, which ought to be *conſidered* at the ſame Time, and with cloſer *Attention* than the other, as being of *everlaſting* Concernment. In ſhort, He intended no Lecture of *Faith* againſt *Eye-Sight:* But He endeavoured, as much as poſſible, to draw off their *Attention* [w] from

CHAP. VII.

who had ſufficiently obviated every Thing pleadable on the Side of the *Romaniſts*. Compare alſo *Johnſon*, (Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 257.) who has well defended *Cyril* on this Head, and *Deylingius*, who in a ſet Diſcourſe has replied to *Touttee*. (*Deyling*. Obſervat. Miſcellan. Exercit. II. p. 163, &c.) Only I may note by the way, that He has ſtrained ſome Things in favour of the *Lutheran* Principles, and has better confuted the *Romaniſts*, than He has eſtabliſh'd his own Hypotheſis.

[u] *Grabe*. ad Iren. L. V. c. 2. in notis, p. 399. conf. *Deyling*. Obſerv. Miſcellan. p. 177.

[w] In Sacramentis non quid ſint, ſed quid oſtendant, *attenditur*; quoniam *ſigna* ſunt *rerum*, aliud *exiſtentia* & aliud *ſignificantia*. *Auguſtin*. contr. Max. l. 3. c. 22. conf. de *Doctrin. Chriſtian*. c. 7.

CHAP. VII.

the Objects of *Senſe* to the Object of *Faith*, and from the *Signs* to the *Things ſignified*.

IT has been urged, as of moment, that *Cyril* compared the *Change* made in the Euchariſt, to the *miraculous* Change of Water into Wine wrought by our Lord in *Cana* of *Galilee*[x]. It is true that He did ſo: But *Similitudes* commonly are no Arguments of any Thing more than of ſome *general* Reſemblance. There was *Power from above* in that Caſe, and ſo is there in this: And it may be juſtly called a *ſupernatural* Power[y]; not upon the *Elements* to change their Nature, but upon the *Communicants* to add *Spiritual* Strength to their Souls. The Operation in the Euchariſt is no *natural* Work of any Creature, but the *ſupernatural* Grace of God's Holy Spirit. Therefore *Cyril*'s Thought was not much amiſs, in reſembling one *ſupernatural* Operation to another, agreeing in the *general* Thing, differing in *Specialities*. In a large Senſe of the Word *Miracle*, there are Miracles of *Grace*, as well as Miracles of *Nature*; and the ſame *Divine* Power operates in Both, but in a different way, as the Ends and Objects are different.

[x] *Cyril.* Myſtag. IV. §. 2. p. 320.

[y] Neque quæritur aut controvertitur an Panis & Vinum *ſupernaturali* virtute, & omnipotentia *divina* a communi elementorum uſu, in ſublimiorem uſum & dignitatem tranſmutentur: Fatemur enim in *Sacramentis* omnino neceſſe eſſe, cœleſtem & *ſupernaturalem* mutationem ſupervenire, nec poſſe fieri *Sacramentum* niſi per *omnipotentiam Dei*, cujus ſolius eſt Sacramenta in eccleſia *inſtituere*, ipſiſque *efficaciam* tribuere. *Coſin.* Hiſt. Tranſubſt. c. IV. p. 45. conf. p. 124. Compare *Johnſon.* Unbl. Sacr. Part. I. p. 258. alias 261. *Albertin.* 855.

I SHALL

I SHALL proceed no farther with the *Fathers* on this Head, becauſe it would be tedious, and in a manner endleſs. None of them, that I know of, carried the Doctrine higher than this *Cyril* did; but moſt of them, ſomewhere or other, added particular Guards and Explanations[z]. All intended to ſay, that the Elements keeping their own Nature and Subſtance, and not admitting a Coalition with any other Bodily Subſtance, are *Symbolically*, or in *myſtical Conſtruction*, the Body and Blood of Chriſt; being *appointed* as ſuch by Chriſt, *accepted* as ſuch by God the Father, and *made* ſuch in *effect* by the Holy *Spirit*, to every *Faithful* Receiver. So ran the general Doctrine from the Beginning and downwards: Neither am I aware of any conſiderable Change made in it till the dark Ages came on, the 8*th*, 9*th*, 10*th* and following Centuries[a]. The Corruptions which grew up by degrees, and prevailed more and more till the happy Days of

CHAP. VII.

[z] For a *Specimen*, we may take notice of *Facundus*, as late as the middle of the VI*th* Century, who writes thus:

Sacramentum Corporis & Sanguinis ejus, quod eſt in pane & calice conſecrato, *Corpus* ejus & *Sanguinem* dicimus: Non quod propriè Corpus ejus ſit *Panis*, & *Poculum* Sanguis, ſed quod in ſe *myſterium* Corporis ejus Sanguiniſque contineant. Hinc & ipſe Dominus benedictum Panem & Calicem, quem diſcipulis tradidit, *Corpus* & *Sanguinem* ſuum vocavit. Quocirca, ſicut Chriſti Fideles, *Sacramentum Corporis & Sanguinis* ejus accipientes, *Corpus* & *Sanguinem* Chriſti recte dicuntur accipere; ſic & ipſe Chriſtus *Sacramentum Adoptionis* Filiorum cum ſuſcepiſſet, potuit recte dici *Adoptionem* Filiorum accepiſſe. *Facund. Hermian.* L. IX. c. 5. conf. *Ephræm. Antioch.* in Phot. Cod. 229. p. 793.

[a] See *L'Arroque* Hiſt. of the Euchariſt, Part II. c. XII, XIII, &c.

CHAP. VII. Reformation, are very well known[b], and need no particular recital.

Luther firſt, and afterwards *Zwinglius* attempted a Reform in this Article: But it was difficult to clear off the thick Darkneſs all at once; and ſo neither of them did it to ſuch Perfection as might have been wiſhed. One threw off *Tranſubſtantiation* very juſtly, but yet retained I know not what *corporal*, *local* Preſence, and therefore did not retrench enough: The other threw off all corporal and local Preſence very rightly, but threw off withal (or too much neglected) the *Spiritual Preſence*, and *Spiritual Graces:* Which was retrenching a great deal too much[c]. It muſt however be own'd, that Apologies have been ſince made for *Zwinglius*, as for one that erred in *Expreſſion* rather than in real *Meaning*, or that corrected his Sentiments on Second Thoughts[d]. And it is certain that his Friends and Followers, within a while, came into the old and true Notion of *Spiritual* Benefits[e], and left the low Notion of

[b] In the Year 787 the ſecond Council of Nice began with a raſh Determination, that the ſacred Symbols are not *Figures*, or *Images* at all, but the *very Body and Blood*. About 831, *Paſchaſius Radbertus* carried it farther, even to *Tranſubſtantiation*, or ſomewhat very like to it. The Name of *Tranſubſtantiation* is ſuppoſed to have come in about A. D. 1100, firſt mention'd by *Hildebertus Cenomanenſis* of that Time, p. 689. Edit. Benedict. A. D. 1215, the Doctrine was made an Article of Faith by the *Lateran* Council, under *Innocent* the III*d*. Afterwards, it was re-eſtabliſhed in the Trent-Council A. D. 1551, and at length in Pope *Pius*'s Creed A. D 1564.

[c] Vid. *Calvin.* de Cœna Domini p. 10. & contr. *Weſtphal.* p. 707, 774.

[d] See ABp. *Wake*, Diſcourſe on the Holy Euchariſt, p. 83.

[e] See *Hooker*, p. 306.

naked

naked *Signs* and *Figures* to the *Anabaptiſts* of thoſe Times; where they reſted, till again revived by the *Socinians*, who afterwards handed them down to the *Remonſtrants*. CHAP. VII.

Calvin came after *Zwinglius*, and refined upon his Scheme, ſteering a kind of middle Courſe, between the Extremes. He appears to have ſet out right, laying his Ground-Work with good Judgment: And had He but as carefully built upon it afterwards, no Fault could have been juſtly found. In the firſt Edition of his *Inſtitutions* (printed at *Baſil* A. D. 1536,) He writes thus: "We ſay that they [the Body "and Blood] are *truly* and *efficaciouſly* exhibited "to us, but not *naturally*. By which we "mean, not that the *very Subſtance* of his Body, "or that the *real* and *natural* Body of Chriſt "are *there given*, but all the Benefits which "Chriſt procured for us in his Body. This "is that *Preſence* of his Body which the Na-"ture of a *Sacrament* requires[f]. This came very near the Truth, and the whole Truth: Only there was an *Ambiguity*, which He was not aware of, in the Words *there given*; and ſo, for want of a proper *Diſtinction*, his Account was too *confuſed*. He ſhould have ſaid, that the *natural* Body is *there given*, but *not there preſent*, which is what He really meant. The

[f] Dicimus *verè* & *efficaciter* exhiberi, non autem naturaliter. Quo ſcilicet ſignificamus, non *ſubſtantiam* ipſam corporis, ſeu *verum* & naturale Chriſti Corpus *illic dari*, ſed omnia quæ in ſuo corpore nobis *Beneficia* Chriſtus præſtitit. Ea eſt corporis *præſentia* quam *Sacramenti* Ratio poſtulat. *Calvin.* Inſtit. apud *Wake* p. 47.

myſtical

CHAP. VII. *myſtical Union* with our Lord's *glorified* Body is *there* (or in that Service) ſtrengthened, or *perfected*; as a *Right* may be given to a *diſtant* Poſſeſſion: And ſuch *Union* as we now ſpeak of, requires no *local* Preſence of Chriſt's Body. Here that great Man, and illuſtrious Reformer was ſomewhat embroiled, and could never ſufficiently extricate Himſelf afterwards. He was well aware, that to aſſert only an Application of the *Merit* or *Virtue* of Chriſt's Paſſion, in the Euchariſt, came not fully up to many ſtrong Expreſſions of the ancient *Fathers* relating to our Union with the *natural*, and now *glorified* Body: Nay, it appeared to fall ſhort of St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, which repreſents the true Diſciples of Chriſt, as *Members of his Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones* [g]. I ſay, *Calvin* was well aware of this Difficulty, and more eſpecially after He had been warmly preſſed on that Head, in his Diſputes with the *Lutherans*. So He found Himſelf to be under a neceſſity of bringing in the *natural* Body ſome way or other [h], but did it a little confuſedly, and out of courſe. He made it the *Ground* [i], inſtead of reckoning it

[g] *Epheſ.* V. 30.

[h] Neque enim mortis tantum ac Reſurrectionis ſuæ *Beneficium* nobis offert Chriſtus, ſed *Corpus ipſum* in quo paſſus eſt & reſurrexit. Concludo, realiter, hoc eſt vere, nobis in Cœna dari *Chriſti Corpus*, ut ſit Animis noſtris in *cibum* ſalutarem. ——— Intelligo, *ſubſtantiâ Corporis* paſci Animas noſtras, ut verè *unum* efficiamur cum eo: Vel, quod idem valet, *vim ex Chriſti carne vivificam* in nos per *Spiritum* diffundi, quamvis longe a nobis diſtat, nec miſceatur nobiſcum. *Calvin.* in 1 Cor. XI. 24. p. 392. *conf.* contr. Weſtphal. p. 774, 784.

[i] Vid. *Beza* Orat. apud *Placæi* Comment. de Stat. Relig. p. 112.

it among the *Fruits*; and He ſuppoſed the glo- CHAP. rified Body to be, as it were, *eaten* in the Eu- VII. chariſt, when He ſhould only have ſaid, that it became more perfectly *united* with ours: And He farther invented an obſcure and unintelligible Notion of the *Virtue of Chriſt's Fleſh* being brought down from Heaven and diffuſed all around, by the Power of the *Holy Spirit*[k]. All which Perplexity ſeems to have been owing to the wrong ſtating of a Notion, which yet was *true* in the main, and which wanted only to be better adjuſted, by a more orderly ranging of Ideas, or by new caſting it; which has been done ſince.

OUR *Divines*, who came after *Calvin*, had ſome Advantage in point of *Time*, and a greater ſtill in the Rule or Method which they pitched upon, as moſt proper to proceed by: Which was, not to ſtrike out any new Hypotheſes or Theories by ſtrength of Wit, but to enquire after the *old Paths*, and there to abide. ABp. *Cranmer* took this Method: He was a judicious Man, and a well-read Divine; and more particularly in what concerns the *Euchariſt*.

112. Bp *Coſin* follows the ſame way of ſpeaking. *Hiſtor.* Tranſubſtant. p. 35, 43, 44, 45.

[k] Plus centies occurrit in Scriptis meis, adeo me non rejicere *ſubſtantiæ* nomen, ut ingenuè & liberè profitear Spiritualem vitam, incomprehenſibili *Spiritus* virtute ex *carnis Chriſti ſubſtantia* in nos diffundi. *Calvin.* contr. Weſtphal. p. 842. conf. 843.

Corpus quod nequaquam cernis, Spirituale eſt Tibi Alimentum. Incredibile hoc videtur, *paſci nos Chriſti carne*, quæ tam procul a nobis *diſtat?* meminerimus, *arcanum* & *mirificum* eſſe Spiritus Sancti opus, quod Intelligentiæ tuæ modulo metiri ſit nefas. *Calvin.* in 1 Cor. XI. 24. p 392.

We

CHAP. VII.

We have the Sum of his Doctrine in the firſt Page of his *Preface.*

" WHERE I uſe to ſpeake ſometymes (as " the olde Authours doo) that Chriſte is in " the Sacramentes, I meane the ſame as They " dyd underſtand the Mattier: That is to ſay, " not of Chriſtes *carnall Preſence* in the out- " warde Sacrament, but ſometymes of his *Sa-* " *cramentall Preſence*; and ſometyme by this " Woorde *Sacrament* I meane the whole My- " niſtration and Receyvynge of the Sacra- " mentes, eyther of *Baptiſme* or of the *Lordes* " *Supper*. And ſo the olde Writers many Tymes " dooe ſay, that *Chriſte* and the *Holy Ghoſte* " be *preſent* in the Sacramentes; not mean- " ynge by that manner of Speache, that Chriſte " and the Holy Ghoſte be preſente in the *Wa-* " *ter*, *Bread*, or *Wyne* (whiche be only the out- " ward vyſyble Sacramentes) but that in the " dewe Myniſtration of the Sacramentes, ac- " cordynge to Chriſtes Ordynance and Inſti- " tution, Chriſte and his Holy Spirite be *trew-* " *ly* and *indede* preſent by their mighty and " ſanctifying *Power*, *Virtue*, and *Grace* in all them " that *worthily* receyve the ſame. Moreover, " when I ſaye and repeate many Tymes in my " Booke, that the *Body* of Chriſt is *preſent* in " them that *worthyly* receave the Sacramente, " leaſte any Man ſhulde myſtake my Woordes, " and thynke that I mean, that although Chriſte " be not corporally in the outward viſible " *Sygnes*, yet Hee is corporally in the *Perſones* " that duely receive them; this is to advertiſe

" the

" the Reader, that I meane no ſuche Thynge: CHAP.
" But my meanyng is, that the *Force*, the *Grace*, VII.
" the *Virtue*, and *Benefyte* of Chriſtes *Bodye* that
" was crucifyed for us, and of his *Bloudde*
" that was ſhedde for us, be *really* and *effectu-*
" *ally* preſent with all them that *duely* receave
" the *Sacramentes*. But all this I underſtande
" of his *Spiritual* Preſence, of the whyche Hee
" ſaythe, *I wyll bee with you untyll the Worldes*
" *Ende*: And, *whereſoever Two or Three be ga-*
" *thered together in my Name, there am I in the*
" *myddes of them*: And, *He that eateth my Fleſhe*
" *and drynketh my Bloude, dwelleth in me, and I*
" *in Hym*. Nor no more truely is He *corpo-*
" *rally* or *really* preſente in the due miniſtra-
" tion of the *Lordes Supper*, than He is in the
" due minyſtration of *Baptiſme*[1]. It is obſer-
vable, that our judicious Author wiſely avoids ſaying any Thing of the *eating* of Chriſt's *glo-rified* Body, for He ſpeaks of the *crucified* only, and juſtly explains the *Spiritual* Manducation of it. He drops all mention here of the *myſtical Union* with the Body *glorified*, and ſo his Account may be thought a little *defective* as to that Particular: But He frequently takes notice of it in his Book, as one of the Effects, or Fruits of the *Spiritual* Manducation in the Euchariſt, which ſtrengthens and confirms the

[1] *Cranmer*. Anſw. to *Gardiner*, Edit. 1551. In the Edition of 1580, there is added, to the Paſſage cited, as follows: " That " is to ſay, in Both *ſpiritually*, by *Grace*: And whereſoever in " the Scripture it is ſaid that Chriſt, God, or the Holy Ghoſt " is in any Man, the ſame is underſtood *Spiritually* by Grace.

worthy

CHAP. VII.

worthy Receivers as *Members* of Chriſt's natural Body [m].

I MAY ſpare my ſelf the Trouble of reciting the Sentiments of Bp. *Ridley*, and Bp. *Latimer*, and Mr. *Bradford* of that Time, and of Bp. *Jewel* who came not long after: For, They all agreed, in the main Things, with ABp. *Cranmer*, who may therefore be looked upon as *inſtar omnium*, while in Him we have all. I ſhall only take notice how our acuteſt Divines have, Time after Time, hit off the Difficulties which were once very perplexing, by the uſe of proper *Diſtinctions*, between the Body *crucified*, and the Body *glorified*; as likewiſe between *Manducation*, and *Union*. It will be ſufficient to name Two of them: One wrote as early as the Days of Q. *Elizabeth*, and the other as late as K. *James* the Second.

Dr. *William Barlow* [n], in the Year 1601, publiſhed a Treatiſe entituled, *A Defence of the Articles of the Proteſtant Religion*; which He dedicated to *Bancroft*, then Bp. of *London*: He occaſionally ſays ſomething upon our preſent Subject, which may be worth the noting, tho' the Style is not the moſt commendable.

[o] " GREAT Difference there is (perchance " *not obſerved by many*) between our *eating* of " Chriſt, and our *uniting* with Him.——

[m] *Cranmer*. p. 16, 27, 43, 44, 161, 174, 199. Compare *Jewell*. Anſw. to *Harding*, Art. V. p. 254, &c.

[n] The ſame that publiſhed a Relation of the Hampton-Court Conference in 1604, and was made Bp. of *Rocheſter* in 1605, tranſlated to *Lincoln* in 1608, died 1613.

[o] *Barlow*'s Defence, &c. p. 124, &c.

" I. WE

" 1. WE *eat* Him as our *Paſſover*[p]; that as CHAP.
" the Iſraelites ate the one *mortuum & aſſum*, VII.
" *dead* and *roaſted*[q], ſo we Him *crucifixum &*
" *paſſum*, *dead* and *ſlain*. And ſo that Speech
" of St. *Auſten* is true, we have Him here *in*
" *pabulo* as He was *in patibulo*, torn and rent:
" As Himſelf ordained the Sacrament *in Pane*
" *fracto*, not *integro*, the *Bread broken*, not the
" *whole Loaf*; thereby ſignifying, yea ſaying,
" that in doing it we muſt remember Him,
" not as *living* among us, but as *dying* for us;
" *ut in cruce, non in Cælo*, as He was *crucified*,
" not as He is *glorified*. Whereby we conclude,
" firſt, for his *Preſence*, that his Body is ſo far
" forth there *quatenus editur*, as it is *eaten*:
" But his Body is eaten as *dead* and *ſlain*; ſo
" Himſelf appointed it, *This is my Body*, and
" ſtayeth not there, but adds withal, *which is*
" *given for you*. And his Blood is drunk, not
" as *remaining in his Veins*, but as *ſhed*: So Him-
" ſelf ſpeaketh, *This is my Blood of the New Te-*
" *ſtament* SHED *for many*. Now, his Body
" *bruiſed*, and his Blood *poured out* can no other-
" wiſe be *preſent* in the Euchariſt, but by a
" *Repreſentation* thereof in the Bread *broken*, and
" in the Wine *effuſed*, of the one Side; and
" on the Communicant's Part, by a grateful
" *Recordation* of the Benefits, a reverent *Valu-*
" *ation* of the Sacrifice, a faithful *Application*
" of his Merits in his whole Paſſion: And
" therefore his *Preſence* muſt be *Sacramental*,

[p] 2 *Cor.* V. 7. [q] *Exod.* XII. 9.

" and

CHAP. VII.

" and our eating *Spiritual*; for, *non quod videtur, ſed quod creditur, paſcit*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*.

" 2. FOR the *Union*, we are united to Him " *ut viventi*, as our *living* Head, *& nos vivifi-* " *canti*, and making us his lively Members. " It is true which Chriſt ſaith, that *He which* " *eateth my Fleſh, abideth in me, and I in Him*[r]. " Not that this *Union* is firſt begun in our par- " ticipation of that Holy Supper (for none can " truly *eat* the Body of Chriſt, unleſs He be " firſt *united* with Him, and ingrafted into Him: " (*Nec vere edit Corpus Chriſti, qui non eſt de Cor-* " *pore Chriſti*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*) becauſe *Prima* " *unio*, ſaith *Aquinas*, the *firſt Union* between " God and Man, is begun in *Baptiſm* by *one* " *Spirit*[s], as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, and conti- " nueth by Faith, Hope, and Charity; all theſe " the Operation of the ſame Spirit.

" BUT if we truly *eat* the Body, and *drink* " the Blood of Chriſt, then by the Power of " the Holy Ghoſt, and Faith cooperating, this " *Union* is *ſtrengthened*, the Vigour and Effects " whereof, after a *true* Participation, we ſhall " feel within our ſelves more *forcible* and " *lively*. —— Is not Chriſt as *preſent* in Bap- " tiſm, as in the Euchariſt? For, in them Both " we *communicate* with Him; *bred anew* in the " one, *fed anew* in the other: And yet Chriſt's " *real Preſence* is not challenged for Baptiſm. " If They ſay no, becauſe of the Euchariſt it " was ſaid, *This is my Body and Blood*, not ſo " of Baptiſm; I anſwer: As much, if not more

[r] *John* VI. 56. [s] 1 *Cor.* XII. 13.

" was

" was ſpoken by the Apoſtle; *They which are* CHAP.
" *baptized, have put on Chriſt*[t]. Put Him on we VII.
" cannot, unleſs He be *preſent:* And the *put-*
" *ting Him on* is even the very ſame which He
" elſewhere calleth *Chriſt's dwelling in us*[u], name-
" ly, that in Baptiſm we are ſo transformed,
" as now not we, but Chriſt alone doth live
" within us[w]; as near an *Unity* as may[x]. And
" in truth St. *Auſtin* is out of doubt, that in
" Baptiſm the true Member of Chriſt *Corporis*
" *& Sanguinis Domini particeps fit*, is *partaker*
" *of the Body and Blood of the Lord**: And there-
" fore no Reaſon withſtands, but that He ſhould
" be really preſent in *Both*, or in *neither*. Thus
far Bp. *Barlow*, whoſe Words I have here quo-
ted at length, chiefly for the ſake of the *Di-*

[t] *Gal.* III. 27. conf. *Phot. Amphiloch.* apud *Wolf. Cur. Crit.* Vol. ult. p. 737.

[u] *Epheſ.* III. 17. *N. B.* The Obſervation here urged appears to be perfectly juſt, and may be of great uſe for diſcovering the weakneſs of the Pleas made for the *real* and *local* Preſence in the other Sacrament. The learned *Buddeus*, for inſtance, pleads, that the *giving* of the Body cannot be underſtood without ſuch *real Preſence* of the Body; and that no *Communion* can be without ſuch *real Preſence: Κοινωνία inter res quæ ſibi invicem præſentes non ſunt, eſſe nequit. Inſtitut. Theol. Dogmat.* L. V. c. 1. p. 1094. The Argument manifeſtly proves too much; proving (as *Barlow* well notes) that Chriſt is ſo *really preſent* in *both* Sacraments, or in *neither*. If Chriſt means *whole* Chriſt, He muſt be as much preſent in *Body*, to be *put on* in Baptiſm, as to be *orally* taken in the Euchariſt: But who ſees not that this is ſtraining *figurative* Expreſſions to a moſt extravagant Exceſs?

[w] *Galat.* II. 20.

[x] I may here note, that the learned *Wolfius* on *Gal.* III. 27. allows, that the *putting on* Chriſt, implies *arctiſſimam Communionem*, (p. 740.) the *cloſeſt Communion*. Now compare *Buddeus*'s Argument, or Maxim, built upon the Word *Communion*, as implying *real Preſence*, and then judge of the *Concluſion* reſulting from the Premiſes.

* See *Fulgentius* above, p. 186.

CHAP. VII.

ſtinction (as it is a very good one) between the *Manducation* and the *Union*; the former relating properly to Chriſt conſidered as *crucified* and *ſlain*, and the latter to Chriſt conſidered as *glorified*, and *living* for evermore. We *eat* Him as from the Croſs; that is, we partake of the *Merits* of his Paſſion: And one of the *Fruits* of his Paſſion is our *myſtical Union* with his Body now *glorified* in Heaven. One Thing only I think wants correcting in *Barlow*'s Account, that He ſeems to make the Union *antecedent* in natural order to the Manducation; which, I conceive, was *needleſs* with reſpect to his Argument, and is beſides *wrong* in it ſelf, ſince our *Reconciliation* by the *Death* of Chriſt, is in natural order of Conception, *prior* to all the Bleſſings and Privileges ariſing from it. It is true that Baptiſm muſt be *before* the Euchariſt, and that the *myſtical Union* is begun in Baptiſm: But then (as our Author Himſelf afterwards very juſtly obſerves) we partake of our Lord's Body *broken*, and Blood *ſhed*, that is, of his *Death* and *Paſſion*, even in Baptiſm; and That is the *Ground* and *Foundation* of all our other Chriſtian Privileges.

ANOTHER excellent Writer whom I had in my Eye, and now intend to cite, is Dr. *Aldrich*, who in the Year 1687, publiſhed a valuable Pamphlet, intituled *A Reply to Two Diſcourſes*, where, in a very clear and elegant Style, and with great Acuteneſs, He has hit off the main Difficulties relating to the *real Preſence*. He writes thus.

" THE

CHAP. VII.

" THE *natural* Body of our bleſſed Saviour " comes under a two-fold Conſideration in the " Euchariſt:

" 1. As a Body *dead:* Under which Notion " we are ſaid to *eat* it in the Sacrament, and to " *drink* the Blood as *ſhed*; as appears by the " Words of the Inſtitution, *Take and eat, This " is my Body which is given* or *broken for you: " drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood which " is ſhed for you:* In which Words, as Mr. " *Bradford* long ago obſerved, what God has " joined, we are not to put aſunder.

" 2. As a *glorified Body:* In which Condi- " tion it now ſits at the right Hand of God, " and ſhall there continue till the Reſtitution " of all Things, imparting Grace and Influence " and all the Benefits purchaſed by the Sacrifice " of the dead Body, to thoſe that, in the Holy " Euchariſt moſt eſpecially, are through Faith " and the marvellous Operation of the Holy " Ghoſt, *incorporated* into *Chriſt*, and ſo *united* " to Him that they dwell in Chriſt and Chriſt " in them, they are one with Chriſt and Chriſt " with them, they are made *Members of his " Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones*; and by " partaking of the Spirit of Him their Head, " receive all the Graces and Benefits purchaſed " for them by his bitter Death and Paſſion.

" WHEREFORE it is evident, that ſince the " Body *broken*, and Blood *ſhed*, neither do nor " can now really exiſt, they neither can be really " *preſent*, nor literally *eaten*, or *drank*; nor can " we really *receive* them, but only the *Benefits*

CHAP. VII.

" purchaſed by them. But the Body which " now exiſts, whereof we *partake*, and to which " we are *united*, is the *glorified* Body: Which " is therefore *verily* and *indeed* received——— " and by conſequence ſaid to be *really preſent*, " notwithſtanding its *local* Abſence; becauſe a " real *Participation* and *Union* muſt needs im- " ply a *real* Preſence, tho' they do not neceſ- " ſarily require a *local* one. For, it is eaſy to " conceive, how a Thing that is locally abſent, " may yet be really *received*,——as we com- " monly ſay, a Man *receives* an *Eſtate*, or *In-* " *heritance*, when He receives the *Deeds* or " *Conveyances* of it.—— The *Reception* is con- " feſſedly *real*, tho' the Thing it ſelf is not *lo-* " *cally*, or *circumſcriptively* preſent, or literally " *graſped* in the Arms of the Receiver.—— " The Proteſtants all agree, that we *Spiritually* " *eat* Chriſt's Body, and *drink* his Blood; that " we neither eat, nor drink, nor receive the " *dead* Body, nor the Blood *ſhed*, but only the " *Benefits* purchaſed by them; that thoſe Bene- " fits are *derived* to us by virtue of our *Union* " and *Communion* with the *glorified Body*[y], and " that our *partaking* of it and *Union* with it is " effected by the myſterious and ineffable Ope- " ration of the Holy Spirit.——

" Now tho' it be eaſy, as I ſaid before, to " conceive how a natural Subſtance may be " ſaid to be really *received*, tho' not locally " *preſent*, it is not ſo eaſy to conceive it *really* " *preſent*, when at the ſame Time it is *locally* " *abſent*.

[y] How this is to be underſtood, ſee above, p. 147, 148.

" *abſent.* Therefore the *Church* of *England* has " wiſely forborn to uſe the Term of *real Pre-* " *ſence*, in all the Books that are ſet forth by " her Authority. We neither find it recom- " mended in the *Liturgy*, nor the *Articles*, nor " the *Homilies*, nor the *Church*'s, nor *Nowell*'s " Catechiſm. —— So that if any Church-of- " England-Man uſe it, He does more than the " *Church* directs Him: If any reject it, He has " the Church's Example to warrant Him.— — " Yet it muſt not be denied but the Term may " be ſafely uſed among *Scholars*, and ſeems to " be grounded upon Scripture it ſelf [z]. ——

" So much for the uſe of the *Word*; which " when we of the Church of *England* uſe, we " mean thus: A Thing may be ſaid to be really " *received*, which is ſo *conſigned* to us, that " we can really *employ* it to all thoſe *Purpoſes* " for which it is *uſeful* in it ſelf, and we have " *occaſion* to uſe it. And a Thing thus *really* " *received* may be ſaid to be *really preſent*, two " ways, either *phyſically*, or *morally*, to which " we reduce *Sacramentally*. —— In the Holy " Euchariſt, the *Sacrament* is phyſically, the *Res* " *Sacramenti* morally preſent; the Elements " *antecedently* and *locally*; the very Body *conſe-* " *quentially*, and *virtually*, but both *really* pre- " ſent. —— When we ſay that Chriſt is " *preſent* —— in the Sacrament, we do not " mean in the *Elements*, but in the *Celebration*. " —— This Doctrine is ſufficiently removed

[z] Here the Author refers to ſeveral Texts. *Matt.* XVIII. 20. XXVIII. 20. 1 *Cor.* V. 3.

CHAP. VII.

" from what the Pamphlet calls *Zuinglianiſm*
" (how truly, I will not now enquire) for, we
" do not hold that we barely receive the *Effects*
" and *Benefits* of Chriſt's *Body*, but we hold it
" *really preſent* in as much as it is *really re-*
" *ceived*, and we *actually* put in *Poſſeſſion* of it,
" tho' *locally* abſent from us[a].

I HAVE tranſcribed thus much, becauſe the Account is juſt, and becauſe the *Pamphlet* and *Defence* of it are not, it may be, commonly known. The Sum of all is, that *Sacramental* or *Symbolical* Feeding in the Euchariſt is feeding upon the Body *broken* and Blood *ſhed*, under the Signs and Symbols of *Bread* and *Wine*: The reſult of ſuch feeding, is the ſtrengthening or perfecting our *myſtical Union* with the Body *glorified*; and ſo, properly ſpeaking, we feed upon the Body as *dead*, and we *receive* it into cloſer *Union* as *living*, and Both in the Euchariſt when *duly* celebrated.

NOTHING now remains, before I cloſe up this Chapter, but to hint very briefly the uſe of the foregoing Principles for the clearing off Difficulties, and for the removing the Objections raiſed by contending Parties of various Kinds.

1. To the *Romaniſts*, who plead warmly for *the very Body and Blood* in the Euchariſt, we make anſwer, that we do receive *the very Body and Blood*, in it, and thro' it, as properly as a Man *receives* an *Eſtate*, and becomes *poſſeſſed* of an *Inheritance* by any Deeds or Conveyances:

[a] Dr. *Aldrich*. Reply to two Diſcourſes, p. 13——18.

And

And what would they have more? Will nothing ſatisfy, except the *Wax* and *Parchments* be tranſubſtantiated into *Terra firma*, or every *Inſtrument* converted into *Arable?* Surely, that is puſhing Points too far, and turning Things moſt ſerious into perfect ridicule.

2. To the *Lutherans*, who ſeem to contend for a *mixture* of the *viſible* Elements with the Body *inviſible*, we have this to reply, that we readily admit of a *Symbolical* Delivery, or Conveyance, of one by the other; which effectually anſwers every good End and Purpoſe, as it ſuits alſo extremely well with the Scripture-Phraſeology in thoſe Caſes. And tho' we admit not, that our Lord's Body is *locally* preſent in the Sacrament, or any where ſo *preſent* but in Heaven; yet ſo long as it is really united in *one myſtical Body* with ours, or rather is conſidered as the *Head* with the *Members*, we think, That may ſuffice; and we need not deſire any cloſer Alliance, on this Side Heaven, than ſuch an *Union* amounts to.

3. To the *Calviniſts* of the ancient Stamp, (if any ſuch remain'd now) we might reply, that tho' we *eat* not Chriſt's *glorified* Body in the Euchariſt, yet we really *receive* it, while we receive it into cloſer *myſtical* Union than before: And, tho' we know nothing of the *diffuſion* of any *Virtue of Chriſt's Fleſh*, (which would not profit) yet we have the Power and Preſence of his *Godhead* with us, and, at the ſame Time, a *virtual* or *myſtical* Union with his *Body*, ſufficient to make us, in divine *Con-*

CHAP. VII. *ſtruction*, and divine Acceptance, *one with Him: For, we are Members of his Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones*[b].

4. To the *Zwinglian Sacramentarians*, old *Anabaptiſts*, *Socinians*, and *Remonſtrants*, who will not admit of any *Medium* between *local corporal* Preſence, and *no Preſence* at all as to *beneficial* Effects, no *Medium* between the *natural* Body it ſelf, and mere *Signs* and *Figures*; to them we rejoyn, that there is no neceſſity of falling in with either *Extreme*; becauſe there is a *Medium*, a very juſt one, and where indeed the *Truth* lies. For, tho' there is no *corporal Preſence*, yet there is a *Spiritual* one, exhibitive of divine *Bleſſings* and *Graces*: And tho' we *eat* not Chriſt's *natural* glorified Body in the Sacrament, or out of it, yet our *myſtical Union* with that very Body is ſtrengthened and perfected in and thro' the Sacrament, by the Operation of the *Holy Spirit*. This appears to be both Senſe and Truth; and ſhall be more largely made out in the Sequel.

5. To thoſe who admit not that the *natural* Body of Chriſt is in any Senſe *received* at all, but imagine that the *Elements*, as impregnated, or animated with the *Spirit*, are the *only Body* received, and are made our *Lord's Body* by ſuch Union with the *Spirit*[c]; I ſay, to thoſe

[b] *Epheſ.* V. 30.

[c] This ſeems to be Mr. *Johnſon*'s Notion, in the *Unbloody Sacrifice*, &c. Part I. p. 247. And it is very near akin, ſo far, to that of the modern *Greek Church*, as repreſented by Mr. *Claude* in his *Catholick Doctrine of the Euchariſt*, Part I. B. III. Ch. 13. p. 218.

we

CHAP. VII.

we make anſwer, that the Union of the *Spirit* with the *Elements* (rather than with the *Perſons*) appears to be a *groſs* Notion, and *groundleſs*: And if it were admitted, yet could it not make the Elements, in any juſt Senſe, our *Lord's Body*, but the Notion would reſolve into a kind of *Impanation* of the Spirit, for the Time. Beſides that the Conſequence would be, that the *Lord's Body* is received by *all* Communicants, *worthy* or *unworthy*[d], which is not the Truth of the Caſe. Wherefore to avoid all ſuch needleſs Suppoſitions, and needleſs Perplexities, let us be content to teach only this plain Doctrine; that we *eat* Chriſt *crucified* in this Sacrament, as we partake of the *Merits* of his *Death*: And if we thus have part in his *crucified* Body, we are thereby *ipſo facto* made partakers of the Body *glorified*; that is, we *receive* our Lord's Body into a *cloſer Union* than before, and become his *Members* by repeated, and ſtronger Ties; provided we come worthily to the Holy Table, and that there is no juſt *Obſtacle*, on our Part, to ſtop the Current of *Divine Graces*.

I MAY ſhut up this Account with the excel-

[d] If the Elements are ſuppoſed to be *united* to, or *enriched* with the *Spirit*, all that *receive* muſt of courſe receive the *Spirit*, and be *ſanctified* by Him. For, the *Preſence* of the Spirit, in this Caſe, is not to be underſtood merely of the *eſſential* Preſence extending equally to all Creatures, but of a *gracious* Preſence: And if ſuch *gracious* Preſence is vouchſafed to the *unworthy* as well as *worthy*, then the *Benefits* muſt be *common* to all, and none can eat and drink their own Damnation. The *fundamental* Error of this *Hypotheſis* (as alſo of the *Lutheran*, and the *Romiſh*) is the connecting the *Grace* of the Sacrament with the *Elements*, inſtead of looking for it in the *Perſons* only.

lent

CHAP. VII.

lent Words of ABp. *Cranmer*, as follows, only put into the modern Spelling:

"THE firſt Catholick Chriſtian Faith is moſt "*plain*, *clear*, and *comfortable*, without any Dif- "ficulty, Scruple, or Doubt: That is to ſay, "that our Saviour Chriſt, although He be ſit- "ing in Heaven, in *equality* with his Father, is "our Life, Strength, Food, and Suſtenance; "who by his *Death* delivered us *from Death*, "and daily nouriſhes and encreaſes us to *eter-* "*nal Life*. And in *Token* hereof, He hath pre- "pared *Bread* to be eaten, and *Wine* to be "drunk of us in his *Holy Supper*, to put us in "*Remembrance* of his ſaid *Death*, and of the "celeſtial *Feeding*, *Nouriſhing*, *Encreaſing*, and "of all the *Benefits* which we have thereby: "Which *Benefits*, thro' *Faith* and the *Holy* "*Ghoſt*, are *exhibited* and given unto all that "*worthily* receive the ſaid Holy Supper. This "the Husbandman at his Plough, the Weaver "at his Loom, and the Wife at her Rock can "remember, and give Thanks unto God for "the ſame: This is the very Doctrine of the "*Goſpel*, with the conſent wholly of all the old "Eccleſiaſtical Doctors [e].

MY Readers, I hope, will excuſe it, if in the Courſe of this Chapter I have been obliged ſometimes to *ſuppoſe* ſome Things, which are hereafter to be *proved:* I could not avoid it, without rendring the whole intricate and obſcure. What relates to *Spiritual Graces* in particular, as conveyed in the Euchariſt, ſhall

[e] *Cranmer* againſt *Gardiner*, p. 396. firſt Edit.

be

be diſtinctly conſidered in its Place, and the *Proofs* produced at large: But there was no *explaining* what *Sacramental* or *Symbolical* Feeding means (which was the Deſign of this Chapter) without taking ſome previous and general notice of the *Spiritual Graces*, which are the *Food* conveyed from Heaven, by and under the *Symbols* of Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt.

CHAP. VIII.

1 COR. X. 16, &c. *explained, and vindicated from Miſconſtructions.*

ST. *Paul*'s Doctrine concerning the *Euchariſt*, in the X*th* Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, tho' but occaſionally delivered, will yet deſerve a diſtinct Chapter by it ſelf, as it is of great Moment, and much depends upon a true and faithful Conſtruction of it. It will be proper, in the firſt Place, to produce the whole Paſſage, but correctly rendred, as near as may be to the Greek Original.

Ver. 16. *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not a Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? The Bread which we break, is it not a Communion of the Body of Chriſt?*

17. *For ſince the Bread is one, we, being many, are one Body: For, we are all Partakers of that one Bread.*

18. *Behold Iſrael after the Fleſh, are not they who eat of the Sacrifices, Communicants of the Altar?*

19.

Chap. VIII.

19. *What ſay I then? That the Idol is any Thing? Or that what is offered in Sacrifice to the Idol, is any Thing?*

20. *But I ſay, that the Things which the Gentiles Sacrifice, They Sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, and I would not have you become Communicants of Devils.*

21. *You cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils: You cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.*

I have varied a little from the common rendring, partly for better anſwering the difference of Phraſe in the Greek, between μετέχειν and κοινωνεῖν (be they equivalent or otherwiſe[f]) and partly, for the better expreſſing the three *Communions*, here brought in as correſponding to each other in the Analogy; namely, that of *Chriſt's Body* and *Blood* in the firſt Place, next, that *of the Jewiſh Altar*, and laſtly, *of Devils*. Our Tranſlation has, in ſome meaſure, obſcur'd the *Analogy*, by chooſing, in one Place, the Word *Partakers* (tho' it means the ſame Thing) inſtead of *Communicants*, and in another Place, by ſaying Communion *with* Devils, inſtead of ſaying *of Devils*: Κοινωνὸς τῶν

[f] In ſtrictneſs, μετέχειν ſignifies the taking a *Part*, or *Parcel* of any Thing, with others, who have likewiſe their ſeparate *Shares*, or *Parcels* of it: But κοινωνεῖν is the partaking with others, *in commune*, of the ſame *whole*, *undivided* Thing. Notwithſtanding, the Words are ſometimes uſed promiſcuouſly. *Chryſoſtom*, upon the Place, takes notice of the *diſtinction*, and makes his uſe of it, for explaining the Text, and doing Juſtice to the Subject.

Δαιμονίων, v. 20. I uſe the Phraſe *Communicants of*, to expreſs the *participating in common* of any Thing: Which perhaps is not altogether agreeable to the ſtrict Propriety of the *Engliſh* Idiom. But I could not think of any Thing better, that would anſwer the Purpoſe in other reſpects; and ſince I have now intimated what I mean by it, the *Phraſe*, I ſuppoſe, may be born with. But let us come to the Buſineſs in hand. CHAP. VIII.

BEFORE we can make a juſt uſe of St. *Paul*'s Doctrine in this Place, as concerning the *Holy Communion*, it will be neceſſary to underſtand the *Argument* which He was then upon, with the *Occaſion* of it. The Chriſtians of *Corinth*, to whom the Apoſtle writes, were encompaſſed with Pagan *Idolaters*, and were in great danger of being inſidiouſly drawn in, by ſpecious Pretences, to eat of *Meats* which had been *offered* up, in the way of *Sacrifice*, to their *Idols*. Such *eating* (if Chriſtians were aware that the *Meat* had been ſo *offered)* was, in juſt Conſtruction, *participating* in common with the Pagan Idolaters, of *Devils*, to whom thoſe *Idols*, or *Statues*, belonged. Whereupon St. *Paul* exhorts his new Converts, to beware of ſuch *dangerous* Practice, reminding them of the grievous Judgments of God, which formerly came upon their Forefathers the *Iſraelites*, for the Sin of *Idolatry*. *Neither be ye Idolaters*, ſays He, *as were ſome of them*[g]: And a little lower, *Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from Idola-*

[g] 1 *Cor.* X. 7.

try.

Chap. VIII.

try[h]. But becauſe they ſeemed not yet fully ſenſible, that ſuch Practice of theirs was really *Idolatry*, but they had ſeveral artificial Evaſions to ſhift off the Charge (as that an *Idol was nothing* in it ſelf, and that they had no *Deſign* by eating of ſuch *Meats*, to ſignify any *Conſent* of theirs with *Idolaters*, or to give any *Countenance* to them) I ſay, becauſe the new Converts were not readily convinced of the *Sin* and *Danger* of ſuch Practice, the Apoſtle undertakes to *argue* the Caſe with them, in a very friendly, but ſtrong and preſſing Manner, both upon *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* Principles, prefacing what He had to urge, with this handſome Compliment to them: *I ſpeak as to wiſe Men* (I appeal to your own *good Senſe* and *Sagacity) judge ye what I ſay*[i]. Then He proceeds to argue in the way of *Parallel*, or by Parity of Reaſon, from the Caſe of the *Chriſtian Euchariſt*, and the *Jewiſh Feaſts* upon Peace-Offerings, in order to infer from Both, that as the *Euchariſt* is interpretatively a *participating* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, and as the *Jewiſh Feaſts* were *participating* of the *Altar*; ſo the *eating* of *Idol-Meats* was interpretatively a *participating* of *Devils*. To take the Apoſtle's Argument in its juſt and full View, we muſt conſider Him as bearing in mind *two* diſtinct Things which He had upon his Hands to prove by one and the ſame Argument: The firſt was, that eating of the *Idol-Sacrifices* (knowingly) was *interpretatively* conſenting with the *Idolaters*, or *commu-*

[h] 1 *Cor.* X. 14. [i] 1 *Cor.* X. 15.

nicating

nicating with them, tho' they might *mean* nothing leſs; and the ſecond was, that ſuch conſenting with the Idolaters was interpretatively, or in effect, *participating* of *Devils.* Such being the Caſe, it could not but appear to be of very *dangerous* Conſequence, knowingly to *eat* of Things *offered* to *Idols.* CHAP. VIII.

FROM this view of the Apoſtle's Argument, I paſs on to conſider what we may hence infer with reſpect to his *Doctrine* of the *Euchariſt*, thus *occaſionally* delivered as the true, and *well-known* Doctrine of Chriſt. His Account of it is briefly expreſſed, in its being a *Communion* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*; that is to ſay, of the Body conſidered as *broken*, and of the Blood conſidered as *ſhed*; as is very plain from the Terms of the *Inſtitution:* And it is not improbable that the Apoſtle here ſo *diſtinctly* mentioned *Both*, to intimate that they were to be conſidered as *divided*, and *ſeparate*, which was the Caſe at his *Crucifixion*, and not after. By *Communion*, the Apoſtle certainly intended a *joint-Communion*, or participating *in common* with others, as appears by the Words immediately following; *We being many are one Body*, &c. Beſides that his *Argument* requir'd it, as I have already hinted. For, He was to convince the *Corinthians*, to whom He wrote, that *eating* of *Idol-Meats*, was interpretatively *conſenting* with Idolaters, and of Conſequence, partaking *in common* with them, of what They were ſuppoſed to *partake of.* And I preſume, that it was with this particular View, and to make

out

Chap. VIII.

out his *whole* Argument, conſiſting of *two* main Points, that the Apoſtle threw in the Words of Verſe the 17*th*. So then, we may thus far conſtrue the Apoſtle's Doctrine of the Euchariſt, to mean, that *Chriſtians* feeding upon the *conſecrated* Symbols, in due Manner, are ſuppoſed therein to be *joint-Partakers* of, or *Communicants* in Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, whatever that means, and alſo to be myſtically united with each other. Now we come to the main Point of all, namely, what that *partaking*, or that *Communion* of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood*, ſtrictly, or preciſely ſignifies. *Moderns* have been ſtrangely divided about it (tho' it was anciently a very *plain* Thing) and perhaps it may be thought a piece of Reſpect due to them, to mention their ſeveral *Interpretations*, tho' we muſt reject all but *one*, as *late* Devices, and more or leſs foreign to the Apoſtle's Argument.

1. To ſay, that the *Communion* of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood*, means the receiving his *natural* Fleſh and Blood into our *Mouths*, under the *Forms*, *Accidents*, or *Appearances* of Bread and Wine, is manifeſtly a *forced* and *late* Interpretation; not heard of for 800 Years or more, and beſides, abſurd, contradictory, and impoſſible. If we may truſt to our *Reaſon*, or to our *Senſes* (and if we may not, what is there that we can truſt to?) The Bread and Wine do remain, after *Conſecration*, the ſame in *Subſtance* as before, changed only as to their *Uſes*, *Relations*, or *Offices*. Beſides, Chriſt's Body

dy *broken* and Blood *ſhed* 1700 Years ago, are no more in that capacity, nor ever will be; and therefore it is abſolutely impoſſible that they ſhould be literally *preſent* in the Sacrament, or made *Food* to the Communicants. To all which may be added, that the Elements, after Conſecration, are ſtill expreſsly called *Bread* and *Wine* in this very Place, and therefore ſuppoſed *to be* what they are called. CHAP. VIII.

2. To ſay that the *Communion* of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood*, means the receiving his *natural* Fleſh and Blood into our *Mouths*, *together with the Symbols*, would be running into the like Abſurdities with the former. Chriſt's Body as *crucified*, and Blood as *ſpilled*, are no more: His Body *glorified* is as far diſtant as *Heaven* and Earth, and therefore not *preſent* in the Sacrament; or if it were, could not properly be *eaten*, nor be of *uſe* if it could, ſince the *Fleſh profiteth nothing*. Beſides, the Text ſpeaks not of *Two Bodies*, or *Bloods*, as preſent in the Sacrament. The Symbolical Body and Blood (Bread and Wine) are there preſent: The reſt is preſent only in a *Figure*, or under certain *Conſtruction*. A *myſtical* Union of Chriſt's glorified Body with our Bodies, is indeed *intimated* in the Text, or may, by juſt *Conſequence*, be inferred from it; but the *direct* Doctrine of the Text relates only to the Body as *crucified*, and to the Blood as *ſhed*: And therefore here the proper *Diſtinctions* ſhould be made between the *eating* Chriſt's dead Body, and the

Chap. VIII.

uniting with his *living* Body (as above[k]) as alſo between the *expreſs Doctrine* of the Text, and the *Conſequences* deducible from it by the help of *Reaſon*, and of *other Texts* compared.

3. To ſay, that the *Communion* here ſignifies the *eating* Chriſt's *glorified* Body by *Faith*, or with the *Mind*, is not a juſt Interpretation: Becauſe, whatever is *corporeal*, cannot be literally the *Food* of the *Soul*; as alſo becauſe what is repreſented and eaten in the Sacrament, is not the Body *glorified*, but the Body *crucified* and Blood *ſhed*, which are no more, and which therefore cannot be received either with *Mouth* or *Mind*, excepting only in a qualified and figurative Senſe. A *myſtical Union* indeed (as before ſaid) with Chriſt's *glorified* Body is ſtrengthened or perfected in the Euchariſt: Tho' that is a Doctrine rather *inſinuated*, than expreſs'd here; while certainly collected both from the Nature of the Thing, and from diverſe other Texts of the New Teſtament.

The three Conſtructions hitherto mentioned have been all owing to too ſtrict and ſervile an Adherence to the *Letter*, without Reaſon, and againſt Reaſon, and not countenanced by the *Ancients* rightly underſtood. There are ſome other Conſtructions which are faulty in the *contrary Extreme*, receding too far from the *Letter*, and degrading the Sacrament into a kind of *empty*, or *fruitleſs* Ceremony. There is the leſs Excuſe for ſo doing, conſidering how highly the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the

[k] See above, p. 254, &c.

Sacrament,

Sacrament, both in This and the next Chapter: For, tho' *neceſſity* will juſtify our receding from the *Letter*, as far as ſuch neceſſity extends, yet *Reaſon* requires that we *adhere* to it as cloſely as we may, and *Extremes* are always bad. But I proceed to take Notice of ſome Miſconſtructions in this way of under-commenting. CHAP. VIII.

4. SOME interpret *Communion* here to mean no more than a *joint-partaking* of the outward *Signs*, *Symbols*, or *Memorials* of Chriſt's Body and Blood. But St. *Paul* muſt undoubtedly mean a great deal more, by his *emphatical* Expreſſions; and his *Argument* alſo requires it, as ſhall be ſhewn in due Place. He does not ſay, that the Service is a *Commemoration* of Chriſt's Body and Blood, but a *partaking* or *Communion* of them[1]. So likewiſe, with reſpect to the *Jews*, He does not ſay that they *commemorated* the *Altar*, but they were *Partakers* of the *Altar:* And the *Idolaters* whom He ſpeaks of, did not barely *commemorate* Devils, (if they did it at all) but, they were *Partakers* of Devils. Beſides, to interpret the *Communion* of a joint-partaking of the *Symbols*, or *Memorials*, is inventing a Senſe too flat and jejune, to be fathered upon the Apoſtle; for indeed it is mere

[1] S. Apoſtolus refragatur penitus gloſſæ *Socini*, quandoquidem *Panem & Poculum* Euchariſticum dicat eſſe *Communicationem Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti.* Ubi *Subjecti* loco, —— *Panem & Poculum* Benedictionis conſtituit, in *prædicato* vero, non *commemorationem*, aut *memoriale* Corporis aut Sanguinis Chriſti, ſed *Communicationem* ejuſdem ponit. *Calovius* de Euchariſt. p. 279.

Chap. VIII.

Tautology. It is no more than ſaying, that partaking of the *Bread* and *Wine*, is partaking of the *Bread* and *Wine*. There is good Senſe in ſaying, that the partaking of *one Thing* is, in juſt Conſtruction, the partaking of ſome *other Thing*: But to make all *Sign*, and *nothing ſignified*, or to reckon the *outward Signs* twice over, dropping the *inward Things* ſignified, is unſuitable to the turn of the whole Paſſage, and entirely defeats the Apoſtle's Argument. The *eating* of the *Sacrifices* was not again mere *eating* of Sacrifices, but it was, by Interpretation, communicating with *Idolaters*: And *communicating* with *Idolaters*, was not again *communicating* with *Idolaters*, but it was, in juſt Conſtruction, *partaking* of *Devils*[m]. Thus we find ſtrong and admirable Senſe in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe: But in the other way, all is dull and inſipid. Take we the next parallel Inſtance: The *joint-partaking* of the *Jewiſh Sacrifices*, was not again the *joint-partaking of the ſame Sacrifices*; but it was *partaking* of the *Altar*, whatever that means: In like manner, a joint-partaking of the *Symbols*, or *Memorials* of Bread and Wine, is not again a *joint-partaking* of the ſame *Symbols*, or *Memorials*, but of *ſomething elſe* (by the Apoſtle's Argument) which They repreſent, and call to our Mind, and

[m] The Commentaries under the Name of *Jerome*, ſuppoſed to be *Pelagius*'s, well expreſs the Senſe of the Apoſtle:

Panis Idololatriæ, *Dæmonum participatio* eſſe monſtratur: — Si cum Idololatris de *uno pane* comedimus, *unum* cum illis *Corpus* efficimur. ——— Non poteſtis & *Dei* & *Dæmonum* eſſe participes. *Hieronym.* Opp. Tom. V. p. 995. Ed. Bened.

which

which in juſt *Conſtruction*, or in *Effect*, They are. Had St. *Paul* meant only, that the Bread which we break is the *joint-eating* of the *Bread*, and the Cup which we bleſs is the *joint-drinking* of the *Cup*, why ſhould He have changed the Terms *Bread* and *Cup* into other Terms, *Body* and *Blood*, inſtead of uſing the ſame over again? Or if *Body* and *Blood* mean only *Bread* and *Cup*, then ſee what Senſe can be made of Ch. XI. 27. which muſt run thus: Whoſoever ſhall eat this *Bread* and drink this *Cup* of the Lord *unworthily*, ſhall be guilty of the *Bread* and *Cup* of the Lord. It is not uſing an inſpired Apoſtle with any proper Reſpect, to put ſuch an odd (not to ſay, ridiculous) Senſe upon Him. The Caſe is plain, that the *Four* Terms, *Bread*, *Wine*, *Body*, and *Blood*, have ſeverally their reſpective Meanings, and that the two firſt expreſs the *Signs*, to which the other two anſwer as *Things ſignified*, and ſo all is right. Add to this, that the *eating* and *drinking* in the Euchariſt, upon the foot of the other Conſtruction, would be rendred *inſignificant*: For the *breaking* of the *Bread*, and the *pouring out* of the *Wine*, would be ſufficient for a bare *Repreſentation*, or *Memorial* of our Lord's Death: The *feeding* thereupon adds nothing to the *Repreſentation*, but muſt either ſignify our *receiving* ſomething *Spiritual* under that *corporeal* Symbol, or ſignify nothing. And it would appear very ſtrange, if the *feeding* it ſelf ſhould not be *Symbolical*, ſome way or other, as well as the reſt; eſpecially conſidering that other Pla-

CHAP. VIII.

Chap. VIII.

ces of Scripture (particularly *Joh.* VI.) do inſiſt very much upon *Spiritual* Feeding, and that the *Quantity* of Meat and Drink in the Euchariſt has all along been ſo ſmall, that it might be difficult to ſay what *uſe* it could be of as a *Banquet*, unleſs allowed to be *ſignificative*, or *Symbolical* of ſome *Spiritual* Entertainment received by the Communicants[n]. Upon the whole, this *fourth* Interpretation muſt be rejected, as being altogether low and lame, or rather totally repugnant to all the Circumſtances of Text and Context.

5. Others therefore, perceiving that there muſt be both a *Sign*, and a *Thing ſignified*, (or in other Words, a *corporal* Manducation, and a *ſpiritual* one alſo) and yet being unwilling to admit of any *preſent Benefits* in the Euchariſt; have contrived this Turn, that the Sacramental feeding ſhall *ſignify* Spiritual feeding, yea and Spiritual *Communion* with Chriſt, *before*, and *in*, and *after* the Sacrament, but that this *Spiritual feeding* ſhall mean only the *receiving* Chriſt's Doctrine, and Promiſes; or that the Euchariſt ſhall not import any Thing *then* received (more than at *other* Times) but ſhall be *declarative* only of what was received *before*, or is to be received *then*, or *after*. The deſign of all which is to evade any Pretence of receiving *Graces* from *above*, in or by this Sacrament: And this is the Scheme which the

[n] Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ὅτι πολὺ λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὀλίγον, ἵνα γνῶμεν ὅτι οὐκ εἰς πλησμονὴν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἁγιασμόν. *Concil. Nicæn.* in Gelaſ. Cyzicen. Labb. & Coſſart. Tom. II. p. 234.

Socinians

Socinians commonly take into[o]. Yea they ſometimes ſcruple not to own that under *Spiritual feeding* is contained *Remiſſion of Sins*, and *preſent Right* to *Life eternal:* But ſtill, they will not have it ſaid, that God *conveys*, or *confers* theſe Benefits in or by the Sacrament, but that we in the Sacrament do *declare* and *teſtify* that we are *Partakers* of thoſe *Benefits*[p], having *brought* them with us, not receiving them there, more than elſewhere. CHAP. VIII.

BUT theſe fine-ſpun Notions, being only the Inventions of *Men*, can never be able to

[o] Hinc vero patet uſum Panis & Calicis non ideo Chriſti *Corporis & Sanguinis Communionem* dici, quod per iſtum uſum demum Communio iſta fiat; ſed quod per eum *Communio* ac Societas iſta, quæ jam eſt, & eſſe debet, *ſignificetur & declaretur. Crellius* in loc. p. 307. conf. *Socin.* Quod Re. Polon. p. 701.

Hoc ritu *teſtamur* nos Corpus Chriſti pro nobis Crucifixum habere pro *ſpirituali* animæ noſtræ *cibo*, & Sanguinem ejus fuſum pro ſalutari *potu*, noſque *Communionem* illius habere, & ſic ad *novum fœdus* pertinere, &c. quæ omnia *Fidem* per charitatem *efficacem* poſtulant. *Racov.* cat. p. 242.

Panem illum *edendo* atque ex poculo *bibendo* palam *teſtamur*, & *profitemur* nos Corpus Chriſti fractum ac crucifixum pro animæ *cibo*, Sanguinem pro *potu* habere, quo ad vitam *Spiritualem* & *Sempiternam* proinde alamur & confirmemur, ac Cibo potuque Corpora noſtra ad vitam terrenam & Corporalem ſuſtentantur: non quidem quod in *hac* tantum *Actione*, Chriſti carnem & Sanguinem *Spiritualiter* edamus & bibamus —— Sed quod *piâ* mortis Chriſti *meditatione*, & *vera* in eum *Fide* id perficiatur, ac porro etiam extra hunc ritum a nobis fiat, quam diu meditatio illa ac fides inde concepta in animis noſtris viget. *Volkelius*, p. 310. alias 687. conf. *Schlicting.* cont. *Meiſner.* p. 751, 788, 789.

[p] Hac ceremonia *profitemur* nos, ea qua dictum eſt ratione, corpus Chriſti *edere*, & Sanguinem ejus *bibere*, & ſic eorum Bonorum quæ morte ſua cruenta Chriſtus nobis peperit (h. e. *Remiſſionis peccatorum*, & *Vitæ Sempiternæ*, quam *ſpe certa* in hoc ſæculo veluti præcipimus) eſſe participes. *Volkelius*, p. 311. alias p. 688.

Chap. VIII.

ſtand againſt the *Truth* of *God*. St. *Paul* does not ſay, that the Euchariſt is a *Declaration* of Communion, but a *Communion:* Nor does He ſay, Communion *with Chriſt our Head* (tho' that indeed is a *remote* Conſequence of the other) but *Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*. In the parallel Inſtances, eating of Idol-Meats was not a *Declaration* of what had been done *before*, nor a *Declaration* of what was to be done *after* (perhaps it was the *firſt* Time, and might be the *laſt)* but that *ſingle* Action was *taking part* with *Idolaters*, and that amounted to *partaking* of *Devils*. It was ſo with reſpect to the *Jewiſh* Sacrifices, the *Partaking* of them was not merely *declaring* their Participation of the Altar, but it was actual *participating* at that very Time, and by that very Act. St. *Paul*'s Words are expreſs, *are Partakers of the Altar* (not *Proclaimers* of it) and his *Argument* requires That Senſe[q]. Had the *Corinthians* ſuſpected that the Apoſtle was talking of *Declarations* only, *virtual* Declarations, They would ſoon have replied, that they were ready to *declare* to all the World, that they intended no ſuch Thing as communicating *with Idolaters*, or *of Devils*, by their eating of the *Idol-Meats*, and that ſuch expreſs *counter-Declarations* would more than ballance any other. But that would have been *Proteſtation* againſt *Fact*, and would have availed nothing: For, St. *Paul* had plainly told them, what the

[q] Compare *Johnſon*'s *Unbloody Sacrifice*, in anſwer to the ſame Pretence about *declaring*, &c. Part I. p. 172. alias 175, &c.

nature

nature of the *Action* was; *viz.* communicating with *Idolaters*, and not only ſo, but *partaking* of *Devils*. Therefore, by Analogy and Parity of Reaſon, the *nature* of our Euchariſtical *Service* is an *actual* partaking of the *Death* of Chriſt, with the *Fruits* thereof. CHAP. VIII.

IF there were need of any farther arguing in ſo plain a Caſe, I might add, that ſuch kind of *declaring* as They ſpeak of (declaring their *Spiritual eating)* appears not ſo *modeſt*, or ſo *reverent*, as one might wiſh, if we conſider what they mean by *Spiritual Meat*. They commonly intend by it the whole *Faith* and *Practice* of a Chriſtian, together with *Pardon* of Sins and a *Right* to Life eternal conſequent upon it. So then, their coming to the Lord's Table to *declare* their *Spiritual* feeding, what is it but proclaiming, before God and Man, how *righteous*, how *holy*, and how *perfect* they are, and what *Claims* they make on that Score: Which would be much more like to the Boaſting of a *Phariſee*, than to the proper penitent Behaviour of an *humble* Chriſtian, appearing before God. It may be thought perhaps, that ſuch *Declarations* are of great *uſe*, becauſe Men will be cautious of telling a *ſolemn Lie* in the Preſence of God, and will of courſe take care to be as *good*, as they *declare* themſelves to be[r]. But it might be rather ſuſ-

[r] Ideo ſimul etiam cogitandum eſt tibi, ut *talis ſis* qualem te in hoc ritu *profiteris*; nec Deo & Chriſto *mentiaris*. Quod ſi talis nondum ſis, id ſaltem omnino conſtituendum, ut talis quam primum evadas, nec committendum ut irritum poſtea ſit hoc animi tui decretum. *Racov. Catech.* p. 242, 243.

pected

Chap. VIII.

pected, that the Effect would be quite contrary, and ſuch a Method of *Oſtentation* would be much more likely to harden Men in their Sins.

However, to ſoften the Matter, they ſometimes ſo explain this their *Declaration*, as to amount only to a good *Reſolution*, or *Promiſe* for the Time to come, or a *Proteſtation* that they look upon a *good Life* as the proper *Food* of their *Souls*. This indeed is more *modeſt*, but then it is going ſtill farther off from the *Text* of St. *Paul*, than before: For, in this View, the receiving the Sacrament is neither *eating* any Thing *Spiritual*, nor ſo much as a *Declaration* of eating, but it is a Declaration only of their own *Judgment* concerning it. Let them therefore turn this Matter which way they pleaſe, They will never come up to the true Meaning or Force of St. *Paul*'s Words. In the mean while, we readily accept, what they are pleaſed to allow, that *Pardon* of *Sins*, and *preſent Right* to Life eternal, ought to be look'd upon as part of the *Spiritual Food:* And we think it decent and modeſt, as well as juſt, to believe, that we *receive* our *Spiritual Food* at the Altar, from the Hands of Chriſt, and do not *bring* it thither *our ſelves*; eſpecially conſidering that Chriſt Himſelf delivered the *corporal* Food to the Diſciples, which was the *Symbol* of *Spiritual*. And tho' we ought to take care to come properly *qualified* to the Holy Communion, yet we come not to *declare* how *rich* we were before, but

but to deplore our *Poverty*, and to beg freſh *Relief*, and new Supplies, from above. CHAP. VIII.

6. SOME think it ſufficient to ſay, that the *Euchariſt* imports our *holding Communion*, or *Fellowſhip with Chriſt our Head*. But this Interpretation is low and inſufficient, expreſſing a *Truth*, but not the *whole* Truth. The Apoſtle's Expreſſion is very ſtrong, *Communion of*, not Communion *with*, and of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, not ſimply of *Chriſt*. So in the parallel Inſtances: They that ate of the Idol-Meats, held Communion indeed with the *Idolaters*, but were *Partakers of Devils*, not *with* Devils: And they that ate of the Jewiſh Sacrifices, were *Partakers of the Altar*. Therefore Bp. *Patrick* well ſays, with regard to the Word *Communion* in this Place: "In its full Signification, it de-" notes, not merely our being made of his " (Chriſt's) Society, but our having a *Commu-*" *nication* of his *Body* and *Blood* to us: So the " Word Κοινωνέω is rendred *Gal.* VI. 6. *Phil.* " IV. 15[s]. In ſhort, the *Communion* here ſpoken of muſt either mean merely the *outward* Profeſſion of *Chriſtianity*, and then it is an Interpretation much too *low*, and is liable to moſt of the Objections with that of the preceding Article; or elſe it means a *vital Union* with Chriſt, as his *living* Members, and then it implies *partaking* in his *Death*, *Reſurrection*, &c. and coincides with the common Conſtruction. The greateſt Fault therefore of this Interpretation is, that it is looſe, general, equi-

[s] Bp. *Patrick*'s Chriſtian Sacrifice, p. 52.

vocal;

Chap. VIII.

vocal; no *Explication* of the Text, becauſe *not determinate*, but *darker* than the Text it ſelf, and therefore fitted only to diſguiſe and perplex the Apoſtle's Meaning, and to deceive an unwary Reader.

7. Having conſidered, and, as I conceive, confuted the ſeveral wrong Conſtructions of St. *Paul*'s Words, it is now time to return to the true, eaſy, natural, and ancient * Interpretation, before hinted, and now to be more largely enforced, or confirmed. The Euchariſt, in its *primary* Intention, and in its *certain* Effect to all worthy Communicants, is a *Communion* of Chriſt's Body *broken*, and Blood *ſhed*, that is to ſay, a preſent *partaking of*, or having a *Part in* our Lord's *Paſſion*, and the *Reconcilement* therein made, and the bleſſed *Fruits* of it. This is plain good Senſe, and undeniable Truth. "The Body and Blood of Chriſt "are *verily* and *indeed* receiv'd of the Faithful: "That is, They have a *real Part* and *Portion* "given them in the *Death* and *Sufferings* of the "Lord Jeſus, whoſe Body was *broken*, and "Blood *ſhed* for the Remiſſion of Sins. They "truly and indeed partake of the *Virtue* of his "*Bloody Sacrifice*, whereby He hath obtained "eternal Redemption for us[t]. It is obſervable, that St. *Paul*, (his own beſt Interpreter) inſtead of ſaying, *Ye do ſhew the Lord's Body and Blood, broken and ſhed*, ſays, *Ye do ſhew the Lord's Death*, till He come[u]. Which makes it

* See above, p. 151, 155, 217.

[t] Bp. *Patrick*'s Chriſtian Sacrifice, p. 53.

[u] 1 *Cor.* XI. 26.

plain,

plain, that *Body broken* and *Blood ſhed* are, in this Caſe, equivalent to the ſingle Word *Death* with its *Fruits*; and That is the *Thing ſignified* in our Sacramental Service. And if That be the Thing *ſignified*, it is That which we *partake of*, or *Spiritually* receive: And we are in this Sacrament ingrafted, as it were, into the *Death* of Chriſt, in much the ſame Senſe, and to the ſame Effect, as in the other Sacrament we are ſaid to be *baptized into his Death*[w], and *planted together in the likeneſs of his Death*[x]. All the difference is, that the ſame Thing is *repreſented*, and *exhibited*, here and there, under *different* Signs, or Symbols. There we have our *Right* and *Title* to the Merits and Benefits of his Paſſion, delivered to us under the Symbol of *Water* incloſing us, as a *Grave* incloſes a dead Body; Here we have the ſame *Right* and *Title* again delivered under the Symbols of *Bread* and *Wine*[y], received by us, and incorporated with us. But of the Analogy of the two *Sacraments*, I have ſpoken before[z], and need not repeat. Only let it be remembred, that *Baptiſm* does not only *repreſent* our Lord's Death, Burial, and Reſurrection, but *exhibits* them likewiſe in their *Fruits* and *Virtue*, and makes the baptized Party, if fitly qualified, *Partaker* of them. And as there undoubtedly is a near Correſpondence and Analogy between the two

CHAP. VIII.

[w] *Rom.* VI. 3. [x] *Rom.* VI. 5.

[y] Τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας — δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς τῷ Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς θεότητος. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. III. p. 70.

[z] See above, Ch. VII. p. 211.

Sacraments,

Chap. VIII.

Sacraments, in their general *Nature*, *Ends*, and *Uſes*, we may juſtly argue from one Sacrament to the other; and the Argument carries in it, if not the Force of *Demonſtration*, yet very conſiderable Weight. There is this further uſe in it, that it furniſhes us with a clear and full Anſwer to the Objections made againſt the Suppoſition of ſuch and ſuch Privileges being conferr'd by, or annex'd to a *ſingle* Act of Religion: For, if they are annex'd to, or conferr'd by *Baptiſm*, *a ſingle Act of Religion*, why may they not by the *Euchariſt* alſo, tho' a *ſingle* Act? Such Objections either ſtrike at *Both* Sacraments, or can really *hurt neither*: Or if it be allow'd (as indeed it muſt) that *Baptiſm*, notwithſtanding, has ſuch *Privileges* annex'd to it, by the *expreſs* Words of Scripture, it muſt be allow'd that the *Euchariſt*, at leaſt, *may have* the ſame. If, for inſtance, *Remiſſion* of Sins, *Sanctification* of the Spirit, *myſtical Union* with Chriſt, *preſent Right* to a Reſurrection and Life eternal, are (as they certainly are) conferr'd in and by *Baptiſm*, to Perſons fitly qualified; it is in vain to object, in the Caſe of the *Euchariſt*, that thoſe Privileges cannot be annex'd to, or conferr'd by a *ſingle* Act.

But let us return to our *poſitive* Proofs, that ſuch Bleſſings are annex'd to a *due* receiving of the Holy Communion. This Paſſage of St. *Paul*, rightly conſidered, is a Demonſtration of it, as I have already intimated. The *Socinians* themſelves, as I have before obſerv'd, are obliged to allow, that *Spiritual Manducation*

tion carries with it *preſent* Remiſſion of Sins, and *preſent Right* to everlaſting Life: And they are pleaſed to allow farther, that *in the Sacrament* (tho' they will not ſay, *by the Sacrament)* there *may be*, or *often is* Spiritual Manducation. Indeed, *Smalcius* ſeems to heſitate a little upon it, or comes with great Reluctance to it; but after all is forced to ſubmit to ſo glaring a Truth. Firſt, He pretends, that we are ſo far from *feeding Spiritually* upon Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*, that we muſt have done it *before*, or we are not *worthy* to come at all[a]. Well: Why may we not have done it *before*, and *now* much more ſo? He is pleaſed, ſoon after, to allow, that *Spiritual* Manducation is a kind of conſtant *perpetual* Act, or Habit, *ſuppoſed* in every good Chriſtian, in the whole Courſe of his Life, and in all his Actions[b]. Why then not in the *Sacramental* Action? At length, He allows it, with ſome Reluctance, even in That alſo[c]; as He could not avoid it by his own Principles. CHAP. VIII.

THUS

[a] Dicimus, tantum abeſſe, ut in Cœna Domini Corpus Chriſti *comedatur*, & Sanguis ejus *bibatur*, ut qui antea Chriſti Corpus *ſpiritualiter* non manducaverit, manducatione hac panis *carnali* plane *indignus* ſit. *Smalcius* contr. *Frantz*. p. 336.

[b] Ut manducatio *Spiritualis* Corporis, & Bibitio Sanguinis Chriſti eſt aliquid *perpetuum*, quod in nobis ineſſe debet, ſic in omnibus vitæ noſtræ factis conſiderari poterit & debet. *Smalc.* ibid. p. 340.

[c] Quia *ſpiritualis* Manducatio Corporis Chriſti *perpetuum* aliquid eſt, *dici quidem poteſt*, tunc etiam illam fieri, cum Cœna Domini celebratur. *Smalc.* ibid. p. 340.

Schlictingius carries it higher, or expreſſes it ſtronger, tho' indeed He afterwards goes off into the *declarative* Notion, ſeeming to *prefer* it.

Quid

Chap. VIII.

Thus far then we are advanced, even upon the *Conceſſions* of *Adverſaries*, that there *may be*, (or that there *certainly is*, to pious and good Chriſtians) a *Spiritual feeding* in the Euchariſt, and that ſuch *Spiritual* feeding carries in it *preſent Remiſſion*, and *preſent* Right to *Life* eternal[d]. Where then do we differ? Perhaps here; that we ſay, *By the Sacrament*, and They, *In the Sacrament*, like as in *all other* good Offices. But we do not ſay, that the Sacrament does it by its *own Virtue*: No, it is God only that grants *Remiſſion*, or Spiritual *Rights*, whether in the Sacrament, or out of it; and while we aſſert that He does it in and by the *Euchariſt*, we do not preſume to ſay, or think, that He does it not in *Baptiſm* alſo, or in other *Religious Services*. What then is the *Point* of *Controverſy* ſtill remaining? It appears to be this principally, that we aſſert the very *Act* of *Communion* (in Perſons fitly diſpoſed) to be *Spiritual Manducation*; a preſent receiving of *Spiritual* Bleſſings and Privileges, additional to what was before: This they deny, alledging that

Quid igitur eſt, inquies, Chriſti Corporis propriè Κοινωνία? *Commune jus* eſt, (ut ipſa vox indicat) Chriſti Corporis pro nobis fracti, & ſic *Bonorum* inde manantium. Sacrum igitur panem qui frangunt & comedunt, modo *digne* id faciant, *Bonorum* iſtorum *participes* fiunt; ut hoc ſenſu ſacri panis fractio, & comeſtio Corporis Chriſti, *communio* dicatur per *Metonymiam effecti*; quod ſcilicet *Communionis* iſtius *Cauſa* ſit & *Medium*: quippe Chriſti præceptorum officiique noſtri *pars* non *poſtrema*; uti qui id facere negligat, non plus *juris* habeat in Chriſti Corpore, quam *Petrus* habiturus erat *Communionis* cum Chriſto, ſi pedes ſibi lavare volenti præfracte reſtitiſſet. *Schlicting.* contr. Meiſ. p. 750.

[d] See *Volkelius* above, p. 279.

there are no *ſpecial* Benefits annex'd to the *Euchariſt* [e] as ſuch, nothing more conferr'd than what is *conſtantly* conferr'd to good Men, at all other Times, and in all other *good* Offices, or common Duties [f]. Now, in defence of our Doctrine, we plead St. *Paul*'s Authority, who aſſerts that the Euchariſt is actually a *Communion* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*: Let them ſhow, that any *common* Service, or any *other Service*, *Office*, or *Duty* (except *Baptiſm*) is ſo; and then They will come cloſe to the Point. It hath been obſerv'd above, that eating of *Idol-Meats*, knowingly, was *ipſo facto* communicating with Idolaters, and that communicating with Idolaters, was *ipſo facto* partaking of Devils, and that the eating of the Jewiſh Sacrifices was *ipſo facto* partaking of the Altar: Therefore alſo receiving the Holy Communion, fit Diſpoſitions always ſuppoſed, is *ipſo facto*, (in that very Act,

CHAP. VIII.

[e] Chriſtiani quia mortem Chriſti commemorant, & pro ea Gratias agunt, non *præſens* Beneficium requirunt, &c. *Smalcius*, p. 333.

Nequaquam in eum finem hic ritus eſt inſtitutus, ut *aliquid ex eo reportemus*, ſed ut jam antea acceptum Beneficium commemoremus. *Volkelius* de vera Relig. p. 313. alias 691. Non in hunc finem Cœnam Dominicam conſtitutam eſſe, ut ex ejus uſu *aliquem fructum* reportemus. *Volkelius*, ibid. p. 684.

[f] Negat *Socinus* hunc ritum *proprie* inſtitutum eſſe ad noſtram aliquam ſingularem utilitatem in negotio ſalutis. *Proprie* inquam, nam alioquin libenter concedimus, hujus ritus obſervationem non minus *ad ſalutem conferre* quam *reliquorum* præceptorum executionem: Verum hæc utilitas & *generalis* eſt, & non *illius causâ* proprie ritus hic inſtitutus eſt. *Schlicting.* contr. Meiſner. p. 791. conf. 795.

Libenter admittimus ritus iſtius obſervationem inter *bona opera* numerandam, & cum illis conjungendam eſſe. *Schlicting.* ibid. p. 798.

Chap. VIII.

and at that *preſent* Time, *by that Act) partaking* of the *Death* of Chriſt, with the *Fruits* or *Privileges* of it. Since therefore the very *Nature* of the Act *ſuppoſes* it, and *implies* it (which is more than the *Nature* of every *other* Act, Service, or Duty does) therefore there is ſome peculiar Force, Virtue, and Efficacy annexed to the *Euchariſt*, above what is ordinarily annexed to *common* Duties. *Duties*, as ſuch, are *Conditions* only on our Part, *Applications* of *Men* to God, and therefore are not properly *Inſtruments* in the Hand of God for conveying his Graces: But Sacraments are *Applications* of *God* to Men, and therefore are properly his *Inſtruments* of Conveyance, his appointed *Means* or *Conduits*, in and by which He confers his Graces. Goſpel Duties are the *conditional Cauſes* of Spiritual Bleſſings, while Sacraments are properly the *Inſtrumental* Conveyances. Neither *Repentance*, nor *Faith*, nor even Sacraments, conſidered merely as *Duties*, or as *Acts* of ours, are properly *Chanels* of Grace, being as I ſaid *Conditions* only: But Sacraments conſidered as *Applications of God to Men* are properly *Chanels* of Spiritual Benefits. This is a Diſtinction which ought carefully to be heeded, for the right underſtanding of the difference between *Sacraments*, and *Duties**.

Preaching of the *Word* is moſt like to *Sacraments* in the *inſtrumental* Capacity; for, by the *Word* alſo, God conveys his Graces. But ſtill *inviting*, *exhorting*, or *calling* Men to be reconciled

* See above, p. 16, 17, &c.

conciled to God, comes not up to *ſigning* and *ſealing* the Reconciliation: Neither is *preparing* Men for the Covenant, the ſame Thing with *Covenanting*. The Euchariſt, as hath been noted, is an *actual* Communion, wherein God *gives*, and Man *receives* at that Inſtant, or in the very Act. Such being the *Nature* and *Uſe* of this *Euchariſtical* Service, in *divine* Conſtruction, and by *divine* Appointment, it is manifeſt from thence, that it carries in it the force of a *Promiſe*, or *Contract*[g], on God's Part, that fit Qualifications ſuppoſed on *our Part*, this *Service* ſhall never fail of its *Effect*, but ſhall be to every *worthy Receiver* like a Deed of Conveyance, inſtrumentally inveſting Him with the *Benefits* of Chriſt's Death, for the Time being; and *to the End* alſo, if He *perſeveres* to the End. CHAP. VIII.

" It is no good Argument to ſay, The *Graces* " of God are given to Believers *out of* the Sa- " crament, *ergo*, not *by* or in the Sacrament: " But rather thus; if God's Grace *overflows* " ſometimes, and goes without his own *Inſtru-* " *ments*, much more ſhall He give it in the " *uſe* of them. If God gives Pardon *without*

[g] *Verbum* Dei quidem comitatur etiam aliqua Spiritus Dei *efficacia* ——— Verum efficacia iſta a Deo *prorſus libere* diſpenſatur, & abſque ullo *pacto* & *promiſſione* Dei, qua Deus ad hos & illos, potius quam *alios*, ejuſmodi gratia donandos, ſeſe *obſtrinxerit*. Cum *Sacramentis* autem, ex Dei *pacto*, conjuncta eſt *vis* quædam divini Spiritûs, per quam agunt *infallibiliter* in omnibus iis quibus *debite* adminiſtrantur, quique illa ſuſcipiunt cum *ea* quam Deus in iis prærequirit, *diſpoſitione* ——— Ex nullo *pacto* tenetur Deus *verbum* virtute ſui ſpiritus comitari: *Sacramentis* autem ex *certa* Dei *pactione*, adeſt *Virtus divina*, per quam *Gratiam* quandam *ſalutarem* communicant omnibus illis qui ſecundum ordinem a Deo poſitum illa participant. *Le Blanc* Theſ. p. 676.

Chap. VIII.

" the Sacrament, then rather alſo *with* the Sa-
" crament. For, ſuppoſing the Sacraments,
" in their Deſign and Inſtitution, to be nothing
" but Signs and Ceremonies, yet They cannot
" hinder the *Work of God:* And therefore Ho-
" lineſs in the *Reception* of them, will do more
" than Holineſs *alone*; for God does nothing
" *in vain.* The Sacraments *do ſomething* in
" the Hand of God: At leaſt, They are God's
" *proper* and *accuſtomed* Time of Grace: They
" are *his Seaſons*, and *our Opportunity* [h].

And now if any one ſhould ask for a Catalogue of thoſe *Spiritual* Privileges, which St. *Paul* in this Place has omitted, our Lord Himſelf may ſupply that Omiſſion by what He has ſaid in *John* VI. For, ſince we have proved, that there is a *Spiritual Manducation* in the Euchariſt, with all *worthy* Receivers, it now follows of courſe, that what our Lord ſays in *John* VI. of *Spiritual Manducation* in the *general*, is all ſtrictly applicable to this *particular* manner of Spiritual feeding; and is the beſt Explication we can any where have, of what it includes or contains. It contains, 1. A Title to a *happy Reſurrection:* For ſuch as Spiritually feed on Chriſt, Chriſt will *raiſe up at the laſt Day* [i]. 2. A Title to *eternal Life:* For, our Lord expreſsly ſays, *whoſo eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life* [k]. 3. A myſtical Union with Chriſt in his *whole* Perſon; or, more

[h] Bp. *Taylor*'s Worthy Communicant, p. 38.
[i] *John* VI. 54. [k] *John* VI. 51, 54, 58.

particularly,

particularly, a *preſential* Union with Him in his *divine* Nature: *He that eateth my Fleſh*, &c. *dwelleth in me, and I in Him*[l]. 4. In theſe are *implied* (tho' not directly *expreſſed* by our Lord in that Diſcourſe) *Remiſſion of Sins*, and *Sanctification* of the *Holy Spirit*; of which I may ſay more in a proper Place. CHAP. VIII.

To return to St. *Paul*'s Text, I ſhall here ſum up the true and the full Senſe of it, moſtly in Mr. *Lock*'s Words[m], with ſome few and ſlight Alterations. "They who drink of the "Cup of Bleſſing, which we bleſs in the Lord's "Supper, do they not thereby *partake* of the "*Benefits* purchaſed by Chriſt's *Blood ſhed* for "them upon the Croſs, which they here *Sym-*"*bolically* drink? And They who eat of the "Bread *broken* there, do they not *partake* in the "*Sacrifice* of the *Body* of Chriſt, and ſtrengthen "their *Union* with Him, as *Members* of Him "their Head? For, by eating of that Bread, "We, tho' many in number, are all *united*, "and make but *one Body*, under Chriſt our Head, "as many Grains of Corn are united into *one* "*Loaf*. See how it is among the *Jews*, who "are outwardly, according to the *Fleſh*, by "*Circumciſion* the People of God. Among them, "They who *eat* of the *Sacrifice*, are *Partakers* "of *God's* Table, the *Altar*, have Fellowſhip "with Him, and *ſhare* in the *Benefit* of the Sa-"crifice, as if it were offered for them[n]. Do "not

[l] *John* VI. 56, 57.
[m] *Lock*'s Commentary on the Text, p. 181.
[n] Dr. *Pelling*, in his *Diſcourſe of the Sacrament* (p. 116, 117, 118.)

Chap. VIII.

" not miſtake me, as if I hereby ſaid, that the " *Idols* of the Gentiles are *Gods* in reality, or " that the Things offered to them *change* their " *Nature*, and are any Thing really different " from what they were before, ſo as to *affect* " us in our uſe of them: No, but this I ſay, " that the Things which the Gentiles Sacrifice, " They Sacrifice to *Devils*, and not to God, and " I would not that you ſhould have *Fellowſhip* " with, and be under the Influence of *Devils*, " as They who by eating of Things offered " to them, enter into *Covenant*, *Alliance* and " *Commerce* with them. You cannot eat and " drink with *God*, as *Friends* at his Table in " the *Euchariſt*, and entertain *Familiarity* and " *Friendſhip* with *Devils*, by eating with them, " and partaking of the Sacrifices offered to " them. Such appears to be the force of the whole Argument. But as there is nothing ſo plain, but that it may be obſcured by Miſconception, and darken'd by artificial Colourings, ſo we need not wonder if Difficul-

118.) well illuſtrates the Caſe of the *Jews*, as partaking of the *Altar*. I ſhall cite a ſmall Part:

" There is an Expreſſion which will make this Matter clear, " in *Levit.* VII. 18. *neither ſhall it be imputed*, &c. When thoſe " Sacrificial Feaſts were regularly celebrated, They were imputed to the Gueſts for *their good*, they were reckoned *advantagious* to them, they were favourably *accepted* at God's Hand, " in order to the Ends for which the Sacrifice was deſigned: " They ſerved to make an *Atonement*, they were effectual to " their Purpoſes, they were good to all Intents, they were *available* to the Offerers (as the *Hebrew* Doctors expound the " Phraſe) This is the true Meaning of being *Partakers of the* " *Altar*, &c. p. 117. In the next Page the learned Author applies the whole very aptly to the *Euchariſt*.

ties

ties have been raiſed againſt the Conſtruction here given. And becauſe it may ſometimes happen, that very ſlight Pretences on one Side, if not particularly anſwer'd, may weigh more with ſome Perſons, than the ſtrongeſt Reaſons on the other, I ſhall here be at the Pains to bring together ſuch Objections as I have any where met with, and to conſider them one by one.

OBJECTIONS *anſwer'd.*

I. Dr. *Whitby*, whoſe Comments upon this Text, I am ſorry to ſay, appear to be little elſe than labour'd Confuſion, is pleaſed to object as here follows: "Neither can the Senſe "of the Words be to this Effect: The Cup "and Bread communicate to us the *Spiritual* "*Effects* of Chriſt's broken Body, or his Blood "ſhed for us, tho' this be in it ſelf a *certain* "*Truth*; for theſe *Spiritual Effects* cannot be "*ſhared* among Believers, ſo that every one "ſhall have a *Part* of them only, but the *ſame* "Benefits are *wholly* communicated to every "due Receiver. See Note on v. 16.[o] The learned Author did well to call our Doctrine a *Certain Truth*: But he had done better, if He had taken due Care to preſerve to this Text that *true Senſe*, upon which chiefly that *certain Truth* is founded. His Objection againſt the *Spiritual* Effect being *ſhared*, appears to be of no weight: For how do we ſay they are *ſhared*? We do not ſay that Chriſt's *Death* is divided

[o] *Whitby* on Verſe 20. p. 175.

Chap. VIII.

into Parcels, or is more than *one Death*, or that his *Sacrifice* is more than one *Sacrifice*, or that it is *ſhared* like a *Loaf* broken into *Parts*, as the Objection ſuppoſes: But the many *Sharers* all partake of, and communicate in one *undivided Thing*, the ſame Death, the ſame Sacrifice, the ſame Atonement, the ſame Saviour, the ſame God and Lord; And here is no *dividing* or ſharing any Thing, but as the ſame *common Bleſſing* diffuſes itſelf among many divided Perſons. And what is there amiſs, or improper in this Notion? The learned Author himſelf is forced to allow [p], that Κοινωνία τῦ υἱῦ αὐτῦ, *Communion of his Son* [q], and Κοινωνία τ παθημάτων, *Communion of his Sufferings* [r], and Κοινωνία μετὰ τῦ πατρὸς ϗ μετὰ τῦ υἱῦ αὐτῦ, *Communion with the Father and the Son* [s], are all ſo many proper Phraſes, to expreſs the Communion of *many* in one and the ſame Thing, where the Effects are *common* to thoſe many. And he might have added Κοινωνία τῦ ἁγίυ πνεύματος, *Communion of the Holy Ghoſt* [t], and Κοινωνία τῦ μυϛηρίυ, *Communion of the Myſtery* [u], as two other parallel Inſtances, wherein the ſame *undivided* Bleſſings are ſuppoſed to be communicated to *many*, in ſuch a Senſe as we ſuppoſe the undivided Bleſſing, Privilege, Atonement of Chriſt's Death to be vouchſafed to worthy Communicants. And therefore there

[p] *Whitby*, p. 173.
[q] 1 *Cor.* I. 9
[r] *Philipp.* III. 10.
[s] 1 *John* I. 3.
[t] 2 *Cor.* XIII. 13. *Phil.* II. 1.
[u] *Epheſ.* III. 9.

is

is no occaſion for the low Thought, that Κοινωνία here, with reſpect to the Euchariſt, muſt ſignify no more than the *ſharing out* the conſecrated *Bread* and *Wine* among the Communicants: Which is reſolving all into *Sign*, and dropping the Thing *ſignified*; and is ſinking the Apoſtle's admirable Senſe into jejune, inſipid *Tautology*; as I have before obſerved. The *Socinians* themſelves deal more juſtly and ingenuouſly with St. *Paul*'s Text in this Place; as may ſufficiently appear by what I have quoted from them in this Chapter. CHAP. VIII.

II. THE ſame learned Man makes a further Attempt to defeat the true Senſe of this Paſſage, firſt, by interpreting the *partaking of the Altar*, to mean only having *Communion with God*, or *owning* Him as *That God* from whom They had received *Mercies*; and next, by interpreting the *partaking of Devils* ſo as to exclude any *Spiritual Influence* from *Devils*[w]. To all which I ſhall make anſwer in the excellent Words of Bp. *Burnet*[x]. "If the meaning of their being *Partakers with Devils*, [He ſhould have ſaid, *of Devils*] imports only, their joining themſelves in *Acts* of *Fellowſhip* with *Idolaters*, then the Sin of this would have eaſily appear'd, without ſuch a reinforcing of the Matter.—— St. *Paul* ſeems to carry the Argument farther:——Since thoſe *Idols* were the *Inſtruments*, by which the *Devil* kept the World in ſubjection to Him, all ſuch as

[w] See *Whitby* on the Place, p. 174, 175.
[x] *Burnet* on the 28*th* Article, p. 317.

"did

Chap. VIII. " did *partake* in their Sacrifices, might come " under the *Effects* of that *Magick* that might " be exerted about their Temples, or Sacri- " fices; — and might juſtly fear being brought " into *Partnerſhip* of thoſe *magical* Poſſeſſions, " or Temptations that might be ſuffered to " fall upon ſuch Chriſtians as ſhould aſſociate " themſelves in ſo deteſtable a Service[y]. In " the ſame Senſe it was alſo ſaid, that the *Iſ-* " *raelites* were *Partakers of the Altar*. That is, " that all of them who join'd in the Acts of " that Religion, ſuch as the offering their " *Peace-offerings* (for of thoſe of that kind they " might only *eat*) all theſe were *Partakers of* " *the Altar:* That is, of all the *Bleſſings* of their " Religion, of all the *Expiations*, the *Burnt-* " *Offerings* and *Sin-Offerings*, that were offer'd on " the *Altar*, for the *Sins* of the whole Congrega- " tion. —— Thus it appears that ſuch as join- " ed in the *Acts* of *Idolatry* became *Partakers* " of all the *Influence* that *Devils* might have o- " ver thoſe Sacrifices; and all that continued " in the obſervances of the *Moſaical* Law, had

[y] The true Meaning of *partaking* of *Devils*, or of coming under the *Influence* of *Devils*, is very aptly illuſtrated by the following Lines of *Tertullian*.

Nemo in Caſtra Hoſtium tranſit, niſi projectis armis ſuis, niſi deſtitutis *Signis & Sacramentis* Principis ſui, niſi pactus ſimul perire——Quale eſt enim de Eccleſia *Dei*, in *Diaboli* Eccleſiam tendere? de cœlo, quod aiunt, in cœnum?——Cur ergo non hujuſmodi etiam Dæmoniis *penetrabiles* fiant? nam & exemplum accidit, Domino teſte, ejus mulieris quæ Theatrum adiit, & inde cum *Dæmonio* rediit. Itaque in *exorciſmo* cum oneraretur *immundus Spiritus*, quod auſus eſſet *Fidelem* adgredi; conſtanter, juſtiſſime quidem, inquit, feci, in *Meo* enim inveni. *Tertullian.* de Spectac. c. XXV, XXVI. p. 83.

" thereby

" thereby a *Partnerſhip* in the *Expiations* of the CHAP.
" *Altar:* So likewiſe all Chriſtians who *receive* VIII.
" this Sacrament *worthily*, have by their ſo do-
" ing a *Share* in That which is *repreſented* by
" it, the *Death* of Chriſt, and the *Expiation*
" and other *Benefits* that follow it.

I CANNOT too often repeat, that St. *Paul* is not here ſpeaking of *external* Profeſſion, or of *outwardly* owning the true God (which any *Hypocrite* might do) but of being *real* and *living* Members, and of receiving *vital ſpiritual* Influences from Chriſt; and his *Argument* reſts upon it[z]. The Thing may perhaps be yet farther illuſtrated from a ſimilar Argument, made uſe of by the Apoſtle in a reſembling Caſe. *Know ye not that your Bodies are the Members of Chriſt? Shall I then take the Members of Chriſt, and make them the Members of an Harlot? God forbid. What, know ye not, that He who is joined to an Harlot, is one Body? For two, ſaith He, ſhall be one Fleſh: But He that is joined unto the Lord, is one Spirit*[a].

[z] Loquitur Apoſtolus de ejuſmodi communione Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, per quam *unum Corpus* cum illo & inter nos ſumus, —— Reprobi & infideles, omneſque ejuſmodi, *Spiritus* Chriſti deſtituti, quamvis ſumant & participent panem quem frangimus, & Benedictionis Calicem, —— non fiunt *unum corpus* cum Chriſto & fidelibus, ſicut ipſe Apoſtolus docet, inquiens: *Qui Spiritum Chriſti non habet, hic non eſt ejus.* Rom. VIII. 9. 2 Cor. VI. *Albertin.* p. 225.

[a] 1 *Cor.* VI. 15, 16, 17. Compare 2 *Cor.* VI. 14, 15, 16. *N. B.* The Apoſtle is plainly ſpeaking, in all the three Places, of Chriſtians, conſidered as *true* and *living* Members of the *internal inviſible* Church, and not merely of the *external* and *viſible*. Nec ergo *dicendi ſunt manducare Corpus Chriſti*, quoniam nec in *membris* computandi ſunt; quia non poſſunt eſſe membra Chriſti, & membra meretricis. *Auguſtin.* de Civ. Dei, L. XXI. c. 25.

HERE

Chap. VIII.

Here we may obſerve, that the *Argument*, in both Caſes, proceeds upon the Suppoſition that the *Chriſtians* whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks to, are *true* and *living* Members of Chriſt[b], and of conſequence actual *Partakers* of all the *Spiritual Benefits* of ſuch Union: Which Union would be entirely broken, and all its Privileges forfeited, by commencing a *contrary* Union, either with *Devils* in one Caſe, or with *Harlots* in the other. The Apoſtle is not ſpeaking of Chriſtians as barely *contradicting* their *outward* Profeſſions, or committing a *logical* Abſurdity, but of their acting inconſiſtently with their *internal* Bleſſings, or Privileges. There was no natural Impoſſibility of *appearing* as Gueſts both at *God's Table*, and the *Table* of *Devils*; it was as eaſy to be done, as it was eaſy for Men to be *deceitful*, *falſe*, and *wicked*: But the Apoſtle ſpeaks of a *real* Inconſiſtency in *Things*; namely, ſuch as lies in the being in *League* with *God* and the *Devil* at the ſame Time, and retaining the *Friendſhip* and *Participation* of Both[c]. All which ſhews, that the *Communicants* whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, were ſuppoſed to be *true Members* of Chriſt, and of the *inviſible* Church, in that very Action, and ſo of conſequence,

[b] Corpus noſtrum, (id eſt, Caro quæ cum ſanctimonia perſeverat, & munditia) membra dixit eſſe Chriſti. *Iren.* L. V. c. 6. p. 300.

[c] Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι ὁ ἀπόστολός φησι· ἐπεὶ πλείονα σωζομένων καὶ φθειρόμενων τροφαί —— ἢ εὔλογον τραπέζης δαιμονίων μεταλαμβάνειν, τὰς θείας μετέχειν καὶ πνευματικῆς κατηξιωμένους τροφῆς. *Clem. Alex.* Pæd. L. II. c. 1. p. 168, 169.

Non poteſtis & *Dei* & *Dæmonum* eſſe participes. *Pſeudo-Hieronym.* in loc.

thereby

thereby receiving all ſuch *Spiritual Benefits* as that Membership implies. CHAP. VIII.

III. IT has been thought ſome Objection to this Notion of *Benefits*, that Men could not be ſuppoſed to receive *Benefits* from *Devils*; and therefore the Analogy, or Parallel will not hold, if St. *Paul* be interpreted as admitting or aſſerting *Benefits* in the Euchariſt. In reply to which, I obſerve, 1. That St. *Paul* does not particularly mention *Benefits* (tho' He ſuppoſes them all the Time) but draws both Parts of his Parallel in *general* Terms, and Terms correſponding: *Communion* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* on one Side, *Communion of Devils* on the other. There the *Parallel* reſts, and there it anſwers to the greateſt exactneſs: For, as on one hand there are ſuppoſed *Influences*, *Influxes*, *Impreſſions*, *Communications* from Chriſt, ſo on the other hand, there are likewiſe ſuppoſed *Influences*, *Influxes*, *Impreſſions*, *Communications* from Devils. The *Parallel* here drawn out by the Apoſtle goes no farther, and therefore it is ſtrictly juſt, regular, and elegant: But the nature of the Thing ſpeaks the reſt, that the Influxes muſt be of as *contrary* a kind, as *Chriſt* is oppoſite to *Belial*. 2. St. *Paul* certainly ſuppoſed *Benefits*, and great ones, belonging to the *Lord's Table:* Otherwiſe his Diſſwaſive againſt the *Table of Devils* had been very lame and inſufficient. For, undoubtedly there were *Benefits* to be expected (*temporal* Benefits) on the other Side, or elſe there had been no *Temptation* that way, nor any occaſion for ſuch *earneſtneſs* as the Apoſtle uſes in the Caſe to diſ-

ſuade

Chap. VIII.

ſwade them from it: And if the Apoſtle had not ſuppoſed ſome *Benefits*, of the *Spiritual* Kind, to be annexed to the Euchariſt, much ſuperior to all *temporal* Emoluments, there would have been but very little Force in his whole *Diſſwaſive*. To be ſhort; The more *beneficial* we conceive the Sacrament to be, ſo much the *ſtronger* is the Apoſtle's Argument for *preferring* the *Lord's Table* before any other that was *incompatible* with it: And therefore the Suppoſition of *Benefits* in the Euchariſt was by no means *foreign* to the Point in view, or *wide* of his Purpoſe, but quite the contrary. For what could be more *pertinent* to his Deſign of warning Chriſtians to have nothing to do with the *Table of Devils*, than the intimating to them, that they would thereby forfeit all the *Benefits* and *Privileges* they expected from the *Table of the Lord*? Upon this foot, and this only, there is Force and Poignancy in what He ſays: *Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils*[d].

IV. It may perhaps be objected farther, that the Pagan Notion of their Sacrificial Feaſts was no more than This, that their *Gods*, or *Dæmons*, might ſometimes condeſcend to come and *feaſt* with them, and ſo thoſe Feaſts imported ſome kind of *Society*, or *Alliance* with Dæmons, but nothing of *Influxes*, *Communications*, *Impreſſions*,

[d] 1 *Cor.* X. 21. 1 *Cor.* XI. 27, 29. If there were not *great Benefits* on one hand, as there is *great Danger* on the other, what Encouragement could there be to *receive* at all? Who would run the dreadful Riſque of being *guilty* of the *Body* and *Blood of The Lord?*

&c.

&c. To which I anſwer, that we are not here inquiring what the *Pagans* ſuppoſed, but how the *Apoſtle* interpreted their *Feaſtings* of that kind. The Pagans believed in *Gods*, (as they thought) or *good Dæmons*; but the Apoſtle interprets all of *bad Angels*, or *Devils*. And it is further obſervable, that He ſpeaks not of partaking *with Devils* of ſuch Banquets, but of partaking *with Idolaters*, of Devils. All the Expreſſions made uſe of by the Apoſtle, declare for this Meaning. Κοινωνία τῦ σώματος, is partaking *of Body*, not *with* Body. Κοινωνία τῦ αἵματος, is partaking *of Blood*, not *with* Blood. Κοινωνία τῦ θυσιαστηρίυ, is partaking *of* the Altar, not *with* the Altar. In like manner, Κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων muſt mean partaking *of* Devils, not *with* Devils[e]. For, in truth, the Communicants in the Idol-Sacrifices were Joint-Partakers *with* Idolaters, *of Devils*, as Chriſtian Communicants are Joint-Partakers *with* Chriſtians, *of Chriſt*. Thus the *Analogy* is duly preſerved, and the *Compariſon* anſwers to the greateſt exactneſs. CHAP. VIII.

I MAY here briefly take Notice, in paſſing, that what concerns the *Communion*, or *Participation* of *Devils*, has been very minutely examined among ſome learned Divines abroad, within theſe 30 Years laſt paſt. *Gottofr. Olearius*, a

[e] An ancient Writer, of the third Century, well expreſſes this Matter.

Quantum enim ad *creaturam* pertineat, omnis *munda* eſt: Sed cum *Dæmoniis* immolata fuerit, *inquinata* eſt tam diu quam diu ſimulachris offeratur. Quod mox atque factum eſt, non eſt jam *Dei*, ſed *Idoli*: Quæ dum in Cibum ſumitur, ſumentem *Dæmonio nutrit*, non *Deo*, convivam illum ſimulachro reddendo, non Chriſto. *Novatian.* de Cib. Judaic. c. VII.

Chap. VIII.

learned *Lutheran* of *Leipſic*, opened the Subject in a *Diſſertation* on 1 *Cor.* X. 21. printed A. D. 1709; reprinted in 1712. The Deſign was to explain the Pagan Notion of the *Communion* of their *Dæmons*, and from thence to illuſtrate the *Communion* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* in the Euchariſt, as taught by the Apoſtle. Some Years after, another learned *Lutheran*, in a Treatiſe written in the *German* Language, purſued the ſame Hypotheſis, and met with good Acceptance among many. But in the Year 1728, Mr. *Elſner* of *Utrecht* took occaſion to animadvert upon it[f], blaming *Olearius* for puſhing the Point too far, in favour of the *Lutheran* Doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, and for maintaining too *groſs* a Notion of *Sacramental* Manducation. Others have endeavoured to defend, or palliate *Olearius*'s Doctrine, and reflect upon *Elſner*, as too ſevere or diſreſpectful in his Cenſure, and as ſtraining Things to the worſt Senſe[g]. All I ſhall obſerve upon the Diſpute is, that both Sides appear to agree in three Particulars: 1. That the Idolaters held Communion *with each other*, by eating of the *ſame Sacrifices*; to which anſwers, in the Analogy, the Communion of Chriſtians *with each other*, by and in the Euchariſt. 2. That the Idolaters held Communion with *Devils* by feaſting at the Table of Devils: To which anſwers our holding *Communion* with Chriſt in the Euchariſt. 3. That the Devils with whom they ſo held *Communion*, had

[f] *Elſner*. Obſervat. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 108.

[g] *Wolfius*. Curæ Crit. in 1 *Cor.* X. 21. p. 461. *Moſheim.* in Præfat. ad *Cudworth* de Cœna.

thereby

thereby ſome *Power*, or *Influence* over them: To which anſwer the *divine Influences* upon true and worthy Communicants in the Euchariſt. CHAP. VIII.

V. THERE is yet another *Objection* worth the conſidering, becauſe it ſeems to ſtrike at the main grounds upon which we have proceeded in explaining the Apoſtle's Doctrine in this Chapter. It is ſuggeſted, that Δαιμόνιον in that Place, does not ſignify *Devil*[h], but either a *good Demon*, or ſomething *imaginary*, a mere *Non-Entity*: And this is grounded partly upon the Conſideration that the *Pagans* could never *intend* to Sacrifice to *Devils*, and partly upon St. *Paul*'s allowing an *Idol* to be *nothing*. The Reader may find this Suggeſtion abundantly confuted, in *Whitby*, and *Wolfius*, upon this Chapter; and therefore I ſhall here content my ſelf with briefly hinting as follows: 1. That the Word Δαιμόνιον, commonly[i] in the New Teſtament, does ſignify ſome *Evil Spirit*, as in the many Caſes of *Dæmoniacks* therein mention'd, beſides other Inſtances. 2. That in this Place of St. *Paul*, the Word ought to be ſo interpreted, in conformity to *Deuteronomy* XXXII. 17. which St. *Paul* appears to have had in his Eye: *They ſacrificed unto Devils, not to God:* Which *Le Clerc* Himſelf, (who raiſes the Objection which

[h] See *Le Clerc* in loc. In his Supplement to *Hammond*, p. 338. Engl. Edit.

[i] A late learned Writer very acutely as well as juſtly obſerves, that the ſacred Penmen when ſpeaking their *own* Senſe, and not reporting the Words of *others*, do *always* uſe the Word Δαιμονιον in the bad Senſe. Dr. *Warren*, Part I. p. 75. Part II. p. 7, &c.

Chap. VIII.

I am now anſwering) interprets of *evil Spirits*[k]. 3. That St. *Paul* ſpeaks not of what the Heathens *intended*, or had in *view*, but of the real Nature, Tendency, or Conſequence of their *Idolatry*. 4. That tho' St. *Paul* knew that *Idols*, whether underſtood of *Statues* and *Images*, or of the Deities ſuppoſed to reſide in them, were really *nothing*, (as having either *no Being*[l], as many had not, or *no Divinity*[m]) and were not capable of making any *phyſical* Change in the *Meats*, which were the *good Creatures* of God; yet He knew withal, that *evil Spirits* ſuggeſted to Men thoſe *Idolatrous* Practices, and reſided in thoſe *Images*, and aſſiſted in thoſe *Services*, perſonating thoſe *fictitious* Deities, and drawing all thoſe Adorations, in the laſt Reſult, to *themſelves*[n]: Therefore St. *Paul* cautions the *Corinthians* againſt putting themſelves into the *Power* and *Poſſeſſion* of thoſe *evil Spirits*, which they were not before aware of[o]. 5. There can be no Senſe, or no Force in St. *Paul*'s Argument, if we in-

[k] Ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ· *Deut.* XXXII. 17. Vid. Cleric. in loc. item in *Levit.* XVII. 7. *Cacodæmonibus.* See alſo *Baruch* IV. 7.

[l] Such as *perſonalized* Qualities, mere abſtract Ideas; as *Mercy, Juſtice, Faith, Truth, Concord, Health, Fortune*, &c.

[m] As Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.

[n] Scimus *nihil eſſe* nomina *mortuorum*, ſicut & ipſa *ſimulacra* eorum: Sed non ignoramus *Qui* ſub iſtis nominibus, inſtitutis ſimulacris operentur & gaudeant, & divinitatem mentiantur, *nequam Spiritus* ſcilicet, *Dæmones*. *Tertullian.* de Spectac. c. X. p. 77.

[o] *Non quod Idolum ſit aliquid* (ut Apoſtolus ait) ſed quod quæ faciunt, *Dæmoniis* faciunt, conſiſtentibus ſcilicet in conſecrationibus *Idolorum*, ſive *mortuorum*, ſive (ut putant) *Deorum*. Propterea igitur, quoniam utraque ſpecies Idolorum conditionis unius eſt, dum *Mortui* & *Dii* unum ſunt, utraque Idololatria abſtinemus —— quia non poſſumus *Cœnam Dei* edere, & *Cœnam Dæmoniorum*. *Tertull.* ibid. c. XIII. p. 79.

terpret

terpret his Words, either of *good Dæmons*, or of meer *Nothings:* For, it would ſound very odd to ſay, *I would not have you Partakers of good Angels*; or of *Nothings*, that is, *no Partakers*; and again, Ye cannot partake of the *Lord's Table*, and the Table of *good Angels* or Table of *Non-Entities*. Beſides that the Apoſtle was obviating, or refuting that very Objection about an *Idol*'s being nothing; allowing it in a *phyſical* Senſe, but not in a *moral* one; allowing it of the Idol conſidered in *it ſelf*, but not of what it *led to*, and *terminated* in. Whatever Men might think of bare *Idols*, yet *evil Spirits*, which promoted, and accepted that Idolatrous Worſhip, were *real* Beings, and very *pernicious*, many ways[P], to the *Worſhippers*, and to as many as were *Partners* with them, either *formally*, or in juſt *Conſtruction*. In this Light, the Apoſtle's Argument is *clear* and ſolid; and his Senſe *ſtrong* and *nervous*; countenanced alſo by other *Scriptures*, and the whole Stream of *Antiquity*.

CHAP. VIII.

[P] *Wolfius* well diſtinguiſhes, in his Comments on this Text, p. 459, 460.

Non tam hic quæritur, quid *Gentilibus* de *deaſtris* ſuis perſuaſum fuerit, quam quod illis perſuaſum eſſe *debuerit*, quidve ex rei veritate de illis ſit judicandum: Poſterius hoc innuit Apoſtolus, & teſtatum adeo facit, cultum illum ſuperſtitioſum & a *malis Dæmonibus* profectum eſſe, & in illorum Societatem pertrahere —— Apoſtolus τὸ εἴδωλον quod nihil eſt, diſtinguit a δαιμονίοις, tanquam quæ verè exiſtant, & ex cultu præſtito fructum percipiant, in Perniciem Sacrificantium redundantem; quemadmodum & οἱ θύοντες ſacra ſua faciant ea intentione, ut cum deaſtris conjungantur.

CHAP. VIII.

VI. THERE are yet other Objections, of a ſlighter kind, which I may here throw together, and briefly anſwer, that no further Scruple may remain. A learned Man very lately[q], in his *Latin Notes* upon *Cudworth*'s Treatiſe on the Sacrament, and in his *Preface* to the ſame, has taken a great deal of Pains to *explain* (ſhould I ſay) or rather to *perplex* and *obſcure* the Apoſtle's *Argument* in this Chapter, and to turn it off to a different Meaning from what I have been pleading for. His *Reaſon*, or *Motive* for doing it, appears to be, to make it ſquare the better with the *Lutheran* Notion of the *corporal* Preſence in the Euchariſt. He takes it for granted that both *good* and *bad* do equally receive the Lord's *Body* and *Blood* (which is indeed the natural and neceſſary *Conſequence* of their other Principles) and therefore He cannot admit that the *Communion* here ſpoken of, ſhould be underſtood of *Benefits*, leſt thoſe *Benefits* alſo ſhould be ſuppoſed *common* to Both, which is palpably abſurd. He frankly enough diſcovers where his main Scruple lies[r]; and

[q] *Joannes Laurentius Moſheimius*, Jenæ, 1733.

[r] Quid ſentiam de Interpretatione hac verborum S. *Pauli*, itemque de Argumento quod ex illis elicit vir doctiſſimus (*Cudworthus*) ad opinionem ſuam probandam, in *Præfatione* aperiam ——— Hic monuiſſe ſatis erit, premi ab eo Veſtigia præcipuorum *Reformati cœtus* doctorum, &c. ——— velle enim *hos* notum eſt, ideo S. Cœnam a Servatore noſtro potiſſimum eſſe inſtitutam, ut Sancti homines, qui ad eam accedunt, cum Chriſto Servatore ſuo *arctius conjungantur*, & *Beneficiorum* hominibus ab eo partorum reddantur *participes*: Nos vero repudiare, qui omnes Homines, ſive *probi* ſint, ſive *improbi*, Corporis & Sanguinis Domini vere fieri compotes in S. Cœna ſtatuimus. *Moſhem.* in Notis ad cap. 4. §. 2. p. 30.

then proceeds to *invent* Reaſons, or Colours, to ſupport it. He pleads that St. *Paul*, in this Place, mentions no *Diſtinction* between *worthy* Receivers and *unworthy*, but ſeems rather to make what He ſpeaks of, *common* to Both; for He inſerts no *Exception*, or *ſalvo*, as He ought to have done, had his Words been intended of receiving *Benefits*[s], &c. To which I anſwer: 1. That there was no occaſion for making any *expreſs* diſtinction: It was ſufficient to leave it to every one's good Senſe *tacitely* to ſupply. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of it according to what it was in the *general*, and in *God's Deſign*, and in its *primary* Intention, and what it always would be in the Event, if not rendred fruitleſs thro' ſome default of the Communicants[t]: But as the real *Sacrifice* of Chriſt's Death, with the *Benefits* thereof, was to extend no farther than to Perſons *qualified* for it, and not to the *impenitent*; ſo every Man's own Reaſon would readily ſuggeſt to him, without a Monitor, that the *Application* of That Sacrifice could not be of wider extent than the Sacrifice it ſelf. 2. Add to this, that nothing is

[s] Si vera eſſet Sententia, quæ inter *Reformatos* recepta eſt, *excepiſſet Paulus* haud dubie *degeneres* Chriſtianos ex illis qui Chriſti compotes fiunt in S. Cœna, dixiſſetque; *noſtiſne eos Homines, in quibus caſtus eſt animus & vera Fides, Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti compotes fieri? Moſhem.* ibid. p. 31. conf. *Gerhard.* & *Albertin.* Reſpon. p. 225.

[t] *Chryſoſtom* is very clear on this Head, *in Matt. Hom.* 83. p. 788. Bened. Ed. And ſo indeed are all the *Ancients*, when rightly underſtood. None of them ever imagined that the *Res Sacramenti*, the *Thing ſignified*, was received at all by the *unworthy*, either *ſpiritually*, or *orally*.

Chap. VIII.

more uſual in Scripture than to *omit* ſuch *Exceptions* as common Senſe might readily ſupply; partly, for the ſake of *Brevity*, or *Elegancy*, and partly for the avoiding *Impertinence*, or *Offence*. How often are the Benefits of *Baptiſm* ſpoken of in general and abſolute Terms, without any *excepting* Clauſe with reſpect to *unworthy* Partakers? It was *needleſs* to inſert any; for Chriſtians underſtood the *Terms* of their Baptiſmal Covenant, and did not want to be told perpetually, that *Simon Magus* and other the like Wretches, tho' baptized, had *no part* in them. Many times does St. *Paul* remind Chriſtians of their *Bodies* being *the Members of Chriſt*, or *Temple of God*, or *Temple of the Holy Ghoſt*[u], making no *Exception* at all for *corrupt* Chriſtians: He thought it beſt to omit *invidious* Exceptions; not doubting but that ſuch plain Things would be *tacitely* underſtood by every one, without his naming them. Once indeed, after He had told the *Corinthians* of *Chriſt being in them*, He adds, *except ye be Reprobates*[w]. But certainly, it was neither *neceſſary*, nor *proper*, to be perpetually inculcating an invidious and grating Reflection. The Perſons whom He wrote to, might not always be *dull* enough to want it, or *bad* enough to deſerve it: A ſofter kind of Addreſs might be both more *acceptable* to them, and more *effectual* to incite them to all goodneſs. There is therefore no force at all in the *negative* Ar-

[u] 1 *Cor.* III. 16, 17. VI. 15,—20. 2 VI. 16.
[w] 2 *Cor.* XIII. 5.

gument drawn from St. *Paul*'s omitting to make an expreſs *Exception* to the Caſe of *unworthy* Communicants in 1 *Cor.* X. 16. Or however, He abundantly ſupplied it in the next Chapter, and needed not to do it *twice* over in the ſame *Epiſtle*, and within the compaſs of 40 Verſes. CHAP. VIII.

BUT the learned *Moſheim* preſently after ſubjoins another little Plea[x], to add weight to the former. He aſks, why ſhould the Apoſtle ſo *diſtinctly* mention the Communion both of the *Body* and of the *Blood*, if He intended no more than the *Fruits* of Chriſt's Death; might not the ſingle mention of his *Death*, or of its *Fruits* have ſufficed? To which we might juſtly anſwer, by aſking the ſame Queſtion: What occaſion could there be, upon his own Principles, for *diſtinctly* mentioning both *Body* and *Blood?* Might not *Body* alone have ſufficed, eſpecially conſidering how *doubtful* a Point it has been thought, whether a *glorified* Body has properly any *Blood* in it, or no[y]? The learned Author might better have waved an Objection

[x] Deinde vir divinus *diſtincte* Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti participes fieri dicit eos, qui poculum benedictum, & panem qui frangitur, acciperent in S. Cœna. Quid *diſtincta* hac mentione tam *Corporis* quam *Sanguinis* Chriſti opus fuiſſet, ſi hoc tantum docere voluiſſet, mortis Chriſti *Fructum* ad eos pervenire qui S. Cœna fruerentur? Suffeciſſet ad hanc rem exprimendam, ſi *generatim* dixiſſet: minime vos præterit, in Chriſti & mortis ejus communionem pervenire, quibus poculum conſecratum & Panis fractus in S. Cœna exhibetur. *Moſhem.* ibid. p. 31. conf. *Gerhard.* & *Albertin.* Reſpon. p. 225.

[y] Vid. *Allix.* Diſſertat. de Sanguine D. N. Jeſu Chriſti. Conf. *L'Arroque* Hiſt. of the Euchariſt, Part II. c. 6. p. 268.

Chap. VIII.

which recoils ſo ſtrongly upon his own Hypotheſis. To anſwer more directly, we ſay, upon our Principles, that the *diſtinct* mentioning both of the *Body* and the *Blood*, was exceeding *proper*, and very *ſignificant*; becauſe it ſhews that our Lord is conſidered in the Euchariſt according to the State He was in at his *Crucifixion*: For, then only it was, that his Body and Blood were *ſeparate*; one hanging on the *Croſs*, the other *ſpilled* upon the Ground. That *Body* and That *Blood* are commemorated in the Euchariſt, the Body *broken*, and the Blood *ſhed*: Therefore St. *Paul* ſo *diſtinctly* mention'd Both, leſt Chriſtians ſhould think (as indeed, in *late* and *dark* Ages, Chriſtians have thought) that the Words of the *Inſtitution*, tho' expreſs for *broken* Body, and Blood *ſhed* upon Earth, ſhould be interpreted to mean his *glorified* Body in Heaven. St. *Paul* very juſtly followed the Style of the *Inſtitution*, our Lord's own Style: And by that He ſhewed, that He was ſpeaking of the *Separation* of the Body and Blood, which in reality was the *Death* of our Lord, or ſeen only in his *Death*, and conſequently ſuch manner of ſpeaking directly pointed to the *Death* of our Lord, and to the *Fruits* or *Benefits* ariſing from it. Mr. *Moſheim* goes on, to make ſome ſlight Objections to Dr. *Cudworth*'s juſt Notion of the *Partakers of the Altar*, as ſharing the *Benefits*, or *Expiations* thereof. It would be tedious to make a particular Reply to every little Objection which a pregnant Wit can raiſe, and therefore I ſhall only ſay this: Either

ther He muſt underſtand it of a *real Communion* of, and with *That God*, whoſe *Altar* it was, and then it implies *Benefits* of Courſe; or He muſt underſtand it only of *external* Declarations, or Profeſſions, ſuch as *Hypocrites* might make, and then it will be hard to ſhew how that agrees with the *Symbol* of *eating*, which means *receiving* ſomething, (not *giving out* Declarations) and is plainly ſo underſtood not only in *John* VI, but alſo in *Heb.* XIII. 10. where *eating* of an *Altar* is ſpoken of. CHAP. VIII.

Mr. *Moſheim* ſays no more in his *Notes:* But in his *Preface*, written afterwards, He purſues the ſame Argument; and there He endeavours to invalidate the other *Parallel* drawn from *partaking of Devils.* He will not be perſwaded that the Idolaters did really Sacrifice to *evil Spirits*[z]: But it is certain they did; tho' they *intended* quite otherwiſe. And He will not allow that They were *Partakers of Devils*, becauſe an *Idol is nothing:* Which has been abundantly anſwered before. I ſhall only add, that this learned Writer was not perhaps aware, that He has been *inforcing* the *Objection* of the Idolaters, and labouring to *elude* St. *Paul*'s Anſwer to it, in contradiction to the Apoſtle's clear and *expreſs* Words. St. *Paul* granted that an Idol *phyſically* was nothing, but that *morally*

[z] Nunquam mihi perſuaſerim, Sanctum Hominem id ſibi velle, profanos *vere* malis geniis, aut deaſtris immolare, quæ immolarent: Etenim hæc Sententia pugnaret cum eo quod paulo ante largitus erat *Corinthiis*, deaſtrum *nihil*, aut *commentitium* eſſe aliquid: Si *nihil* eſt deaſter, quomodo *vere* ſacrificari poteſt illi aliquid? *Moſhem.* in Præfat.

and

Chap. VIII.

and *circumſtantially* it ſtood in quite another View: For, tho' an *Idol* was nothing, yet a *Devil* under the Name, or Cover of an Idol, was a *real* Thing, and of very dangerous Conſequence, to make *Alliance* with. But I proceed.

When this learned Gentleman comes to propoſe his *own* Interpretation of the whole Paſſage, He does it in ſuch an intricate and confuſed manner, as diſcovers it at once to be unnatural, and forced. He firſt breaks the *Coherence* of it, in a very particular way, and owns that He does ſo [a]. Then He proceeds to ſpeak of St. *Paul*'s abrupt and *rapid* manner of writing, and of his *omitting* many Things for an Interpreter to ſupply (tho' before He would not allow Him to *omit* a needleſs *Exception*, which no body almoſt could miſs of) and of his jumping to a *Concluſion*, before He had ſufficiently opened his *Premiſes* [b]. Could one deſire a more ſenſible

[a] Exerceant, quibus placet, ingenium, experianturque, num demonſtrare queant hæc *apta* eſſe inter ſe, ac *cohærentia?* Quæ cum ita ſint, cumque res ipſa teſtetur, *nullam* eſſe *Cognationem* & *Affinitatem* Commati 16 & 17 cum conſequente Commate 18, reliquum eſt, ut conſtituamus, *divellendum* eſſe hoc poſterius Comma a *prioribus* binis, novamque ab eo partem Orationis Sancti Hominis inchoandam eſſe, &c. *Moſhem* in Præfat.

[b] Præciſam & concitatam eſſe multis in locis S. *Pauli* Diſputationem, & multa interdum ab eo *omitti* quæ Interpretis *meditatione* ac *ingenio* ſuppleri debent, quo *perfectam* Demonſtratio formam adipiſcatur, neminem in ſcriptis iſtis verſatum præterit. Id hoc etiam in loco meminiſſe decet, quo divinus vir, *ſacro* elatus *fervore*, & incredibili *Corinthios* emendandi ſtudio accenſus, ad Demonſtrationis concluſionem *properat* potius quam *pergit*, nec plura exprimit verbis quam ſumma poſtulat neceſſitas ad vim ejus capiendam. Quare qui rudiorum captui conſulere, & univerſam Argumen-

CHAP. VIII.

ſenſible or more affecting Token of the irreſiſtible Strength of the *ancient* and *prevailing* Conſtruction, than this, that the acuteſt *Wit* join'd with uncommon *Learning*, can make no other Senſe of the Place, but by taking ſuch Liberties with ſacred Writ, as are by no means allowable upon any known Rules of juſt and ſober *Hermeneuticks?* I ſhall dwell no longer on this learned Gentleman's Speculations; which, I am willing to hope, are not the Sentiments of all the *Lutherans*. They are confronted, in part, by the very learned *Wolfius*, as I obſerv'd above: And I am now going to take notice of the moderate Sentiments of Baron *Pufendorf* (who was an able *Divine*, as well as a conſummate *Stateſman*) in his *lateſt* Treatiſe, left behind Him ready for the Preſs, written in *Latin*, and printed in 1695 [c]. He firſt candidly repreſents the Principles of the *Reformed*, and next paſſes a *gentle* Cenſure.

" SOME ſay [meaning, ſome of the *Re-*
" *formed*] that---we muſt not believe the Bread
" and Wine to be a *naked Symbol*, but a *Commu-*
" *nication*, or *Mean* by which we come into *Par-*
" *ticipation* of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, as St.
" *Paul* ſpeaks 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. But of what Sort that
" Communion, or Communication is, whe-

Argumentationem ejus nervis & partibus ſuis *cohærentem* exhibere volunt, *addere* paſſim *quædam* debent & *interjicere*, ad ea plane tollenda quæ intelligentiam morari poſſunt. *Moſhem* ibid.

[c] *Jus feciale divinum:* Sive *de conſenſu & diſſenſu Proteſtantium*, exercitatio poſthuma. Lubecæ. 1695.

The divine Feudal Law: or *Means for the uniting of Proteſtants*. Tranſlated from the Original by *Theophilus Dorrington*. 1703.

" ther

CHAP. VIII.

" ther *phyſical* or *moral*, may be very well ga-
" ther'd from that very Place of St. *Paul*. By
" a *phyſical* Communion, or Participation, muſt
" be underſtood the Conjunction of two Bo-
" dies, as of *Water* and *Wine*, of *Meal* and *Su-*
" *gar*: But by a *moral* one is meant, ſuch as
" when any Thing partakes of the *Virtue* and
" *Efficacy* of another, and in that reſpect is
" *accounted* the *ſame* with the other, or is con-
" nected with it. As among the *Jews*, They
" who did *eat* of the Fleſh of the *Victim*, were
" made *Partakers* of the *Altar*; that is, of the
" Jewiſh Worſhip, and of *all the Benefits* which
" did accompany that Worſhip. So alſo, They
" who did eat of Things *ſacrificed* to *Idols*,
" were *Partakers of Devils*; not for that They
" did *eat* the *Subſtance* of the *Devils*, but be-
" cauſe They did derive upon Themſelves the
" *Guilt* of *Idolatry*. From all which Things
" we may learn to underſtand the Words of
" the *Inſtitution* in this Senſe——This *Bread*
" eaten by the faithful, in the Ceremony of
" this Supper, this *Wine* alſo therein drank by
" ſuch, ſhall have the *ſame Virtue* and *Efficacy*,
" as if you ſhould eat the *Subſtance* it ſelf of
" my *Body*, and drink the very *Subſtance* of
" my *Blood*. Or, this *Bread* is put *in the ſtead*
" of the ſacrificed Fleſh, this *Wine* is *in the ſtead*
" of the ſacrificed Blood; whereby the *Cove-*
" *nant* between God and Men, having Me for
" the *Mediator* of it, is eſtabliſhed. Nor in-
" deed are ſuch ſort of Expreſſions, (import-
" ing an *Equivalence*, or *Subſtitution*) uncom-
" mon,

" mon, whether in Holy Scripture, or in pro- CHAP.
" fane Writers. For example: *I have made* VIII.
" *God my Hope* [e]. *Elijah* was the *Chariots of*
" *Iſrael, and the Horſemen thereof* [f]. *Woman,*
" *behold thy Son; Son, behold thy Mother* [g]. *He*
" *that doth the will of my Father, the ſame is*
" *my Brother, and Siſter, and Mother* [h]. It is
" ſaid of the Enemies of the Croſs of Chriſt,
" that their *Belly* is *their God* [i]. So in *Virgil*
" we have the like Phraſeology, *Thou ſhalt be*
" *to me the great Apollo.*

" BUT in *Articles* of *Faith*, it is ſafer to follow
" a naked *Simplicity*, than to indulge the *Fan-*
" *cy* in purſuit of *Subtilties.* And it has been
" obſerved, that while the Reins have been
" left too looſe to *Human Reaſon*, in this Ar-
" ticle of the *Lord's Supper*, the other Myſte-
" ries alſo of the Chriſtian Religion have been
" tamper'd with, ſo that by degrees *Socinianiſm*
" is at length ſprung up. But if both Sides
" would but ſincerely profeſs, that in the *Lord's*
" *Supper* Chriſt's Body and Blood are verily
"" and properly eaten and drank [k], and that there
" is a *Participation* of the *Benefits* by Him pur-
" chaſed, all the Controverſy remaining, is
" only about the *manner* of eating and drink-
" ing, and of the *Preſence* of Chriſt's Body and
" Blood, which both Sides confeſs to be above
" the reach of Human Capacity; and ſo they
" make uſe of *Reaſonings*, where is no room

[e] *Job* XXXI. 24. [f] 2 *Kings* II. 12.
[g] *John* XIX. 26, 27. [h] *Matt.* XII. 50. [i] *Phil.* III. 19.
[k] We ſay, *Verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful.*

" for

Chap. VIII.

" for Reaſon[l]. So far this very judicious Writer, a moderate *Lutheran*, and a Perſon of admirable Sagacity. I ſhall hereupon take the Liberty to obſerve, that if the ſuppoſed *corporal Preſence* were but ſoftened into *corporal Union*, and that Union underſtood to be of the *myſtical*, or *moral* kind (like to that of *Man* and *Wife* making *one Fleſh*, or all *true Chriſtians*, at any diſtance, making *one Body*) and if this *Union* were reckon'd among the *Fruits* of Chriſt's Death, received by the Faithful in the Euchariſt, then would every Thing of *moment* be ſecured on all Sides; and the Doctrine of the Euchariſt, ſo ſtated, would be found to be altogether *intelligible*, *rational*, and *Scriptural*, and confirm'd by the united Verdict of all *Antiquity*.

As to *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, however widely they may appear to differ in *Words* and in *Names*, yet their *Ideas* ſeem all to concenter, (as often as they come to explain) in what I have mentioned. The *Calviniſts*, for example, ſometimes ſpeak of *eating* Chriſt's Body and Blood by *Faith*, or by the *Mind*; and yet they ſeem to *underſtand* nothing more than a kind of *moral*, *virtual*, *ſpiritual*, or *myſtical* Union[m] (ſuch as *Bodies* at a diſtance may have) tho' perhaps they do not always explain it ſo happily as might be wiſhed. On the other hand, the

[l] *Pufendorf.* Eng. Edit. Sect. 63. p. 211, 212, 213. Lat. Edit. Sect. 63. p. 227, 228, 229.

[m] Vid. *Albertin.* p. 230, 231. *Pet. Martyr.* in 1 *Cor.* XII. 12, 13. p. 178.

Lutherans

CHAP. VIII.

Lutherans when preſſed to ſpeak plainly, deny every Article almoſt which they are commonly charged with by their Adverſaries. They diſown *Aſſumption* of the Elements into the *Humanity* of Chriſt [n], as likewiſe *Augmentation* [o], and *Impanation* [p]; yea, and *Conſubſtantiation* [q], and *Concomitancy* [r]: And, if it be asked, at length, what They admit, and abide by, it is A *Sacramental Union* [s]; not a *Corporal Preſence*, but as a Body may be preſent *Spiritually* [t]. And now, what is a *Sacramental Union*, with a Body *ſpiritually* preſent, while *corporally* abſent? Or what *Ideas* can any one really have under theſe *Terms*, more than That of a *myſtical*, or *moral* Union (ſuch as Baron *Pufendorf* ſpeaks of)

[n] Vid. *Pfaffius*. Diſſertat. de Conſecrat. Euchariſt. p. 449, &c. *Buddeus* Miſcellan. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 80, 81.

[o] *Pfaffius*. p. 451. &c. *Buddeus* Miſcellan. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 81, 82.

[p] *Pfaffius*. p. 453. *Buddeus* ibid. p. 83. *Deylingius* Obſerv. Miſcell. p. 249.

[q] *Pfaffius*. 453. &c. *Buddeus* ibid. p. 84. *Deylingius* ibid.

[r] *Pfaffius* ibid. p. 459. *Buddeus* ibid. p. 85, 86.

[s] *Pfaffius*. p. 461. &c. *Buddeus* ibid. p. 86, &c.

[t] Quinimo & *Corporalis præſentia* negatur, quæ tamen ea ratione adſtruitur, ut Corpus Chriſti *vere*, licet *ſpiritualiter* præſens eſſe credatur. Cæterum cum Corpus Chriſti ubique *junctam divinitatem* habeat, ea & in ſacra Cœna præſens eſt; ſingulari tamen & incomprehenſibili ratione, quæ omnes imperfectiones excludit. *Pfaffius* p. 462. Præſentiam *realem* profitemur, *carnalem* negamus. *Pufend.* § 92.

Unicus itaque ſaltem iſque verus & genuinus *præſentiæ realis* ſupereſt modus, *Unio Sacramentalis*; quæ ita comparata eſt, ut, juxta ipſius Servatoris noſtri Inſtitutionem, Pani benedicto tanquam *medio divinitas ordinato* Corpus, & vino benedicto tanquam *medio divinitus ordinato* Sanguis Chriſti (*modo* quem ratio comprehendere nequit) *uniatur*: Ut cum illo pane *Corpus Chriſti* una Manducatione Sacramentali, & cum illo vino *Sanguinem Chriſti* una Bibitione Sacramentali, in ſublimi myſterio ſumamus, manducemus, & bibamus. *Buddeus* ibid. p. 86, 87.

an

CHAP. IX. an Union as to *Virtue*, and *Efficacy*, and to all *ſaving* Intents and Purpoſes? So far both Parties are agreed, and the remaining Difference may ſeem to lie chiefly in *Words* and *Names*, rather than in *Ideas*, or real *Things* [u]. But great Allowances ſhould be made for the prevailing *Prejudices* of *Education*, and for a *Cuſtomary Way* of ſpeaking, or thinking on any Subject.

CHAP. IX.

Of Remiſſion of Sins conferred in the EUCHARIST.

THIS is an Article which has been hitherto touched upon only, as it fell in my way, but will now require a particular Diſcuſſion: And that it may be done the more diſtinctly and clearly, it will be proper to take in two or three previous Propoſitions, which may be of uſe to prevent Miſconceptions of what we mean, and to open the way to what we intend to prove. The previous Propoſitions are: 1. That it is *God alone*, who properly confers Remiſſion. 2. That He often does it in this Life *preſent*, as ſeems good unto Him, on certain occaſions, and in ſundry

[u] Teſtatur *Zanchius*, ſe audiviſſe quendam non vulgarem *Lutheranum* dicentem, ſe & alios ſuos non ita dicere Corpus Chriſti a nobis *corporaliter* manducari, quaſi illud Chriſti Corpus os & corpus noſtrum attingat (hoc enim falſum eſſe) ſed tantum propter *Sacramentalem Unionem*, qua id quod *proprie* competit Pani, attribuitur etiam *quodammodo* ipſi Corpori Chriſti. In hiſce ergo convenimus. *Sam. Ward.* Theolog. Determinat. p. 113.

degrees,

degrees. 3. That He does it particularly in *Baptiſm*, in a very eminent degree. Theſe ſeveral Points being premiſed and proved, it will be the eaſier afterwards, to ſhew that He does it alſo in the *Euchariſt*, as likewiſe to explain the nature and extent of the *Remiſſion* there conferred. CHAP. IX.

1. I BEGIN with premiſing, that *God alone* properly, confers *Remiſſion* of *Sins:* Whatever ſecondary Means or Inſtruments may be made uſe of in it, yet it is *God* that does it. *Who can forgive Sins but God only*[v]? We read, that *it is God that juſtifieth*[w]. *Juſtification* of Sinners comes to the ſame with *Remiſſion:* It is receiving them as *juſt*; which amounts to *acquitting*, or *abſolving* them, in the Court of Heaven. For proof of This, I refer the Reader to Bp. *Bull*'s *Harmonia Apoſtolica*[x], that I may not be tedious in a very plain Caſe. The uſe I intend of the Obſervation, with reſpect to our preſent Subject, is, that if we are ſaid to *eat* or *drink*, in the Euchariſt, the *Benefits* of Chriſt's *Paſſion*, (among which *Remiſſion* of *Sins* is one) or if we are ſaid to *apply* thoſe *Benefits*, and of conſequence that *Remiſſion*, to our ſelves, by *Faith*, &c. all this is to be underſtood only of our *receiving* ſuch Remiſſion, and *partaking* of thoſe Benefits, while it is God that *grants* and *confers*, and who alſo, properly ſpeaking, *applies* every Benefit of that kind to the faithful Communicant. And

[v] *Mark* II. 7. [w] *Rom.* VIII. 33.
[x] *Bull.* Harmon. Apoſtol. Diſſert. 1. c. 1.

CHAP. IX.

whether He does it by his *Word*, or by his *Ordinances*, and by the Hands of his Miniſters, He *does it* however: And when ſuch *Abſolution*, or *Remiſſion*, is real and true, it is not an *human* Abſolution, but a *divine* Grant, tranſmitted to us by the Hands of *Men* adminiſtring the Ordinances of *God*. God has ſometimes ſent his *extraordinary* Grants of that kind by *Prophets* and other Officers *extraordinary*[y]: And He may do the like in a fixed and ſtanding Method, by his *ordinary* Officers or Miniſters duly commiſſioned thereunto[z]. But whoever He be that *brings* the Pardon, or who purſuant to Commiſſion *notifies* it to the Party in ſolemn Form, yet the *Pardon*, if true, is the *Gift* of *God*, and it is God alone, or the *Spirit* of God, that *applies* it to the *Soul*, and converts it to *Spiritual* Nutriment and Increaſe. This I preſume, may be looked upon as a ruled Point, and needs not more Words to prove it.

2. THE next Thing I have to premiſe is, that God often confers *Remiſſion*, or *Juſtification*, for the Time being, in this *Life preſent*, with certain and *immediate* Effect, according to the degree or extent of it. All Remiſſion is not *final*, nor *ſuſpended* upon what may come after: But there is ſuch a Thing as *preſent* Remiſſion, diſtinct from the *final* one, and which may or may not continue to the End, but is *valid* for the Time being, and is in its own na-

[y] 2 *Sam.* XII. 13. Compare *Eccluſ* XLVII. 11.
[z] *Matt.* XVI. 19. XVIII. 16, 17, 18. *John* XX. 22, 23. *Acts* XXII. 16.

ture

ture (no croſs Circumſtances intervening) *ir-* CHAP.
revocable. Let us come to Particulars, in proof IX.
of the Poſition. *Jeſus* ſaid unto the Sick of
the Palſy, *Son, thy Sins are forgiven Thee*[a]. There was *preſent* Remiſſion of ſome kind or other, to ſome certain degree, *antecedent* to the Day of Judgment, and of *Force* for the Time being. So again, our Lord's Words, *whoſe-ſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted*[b], &c. do plainly ſuppoſe and imply a *preſent* Remiſſion to ſome degree or other, antecedently to the great Day, and during this *preſent* Life. *All that believe (viz.* with a Faith working by Love) *are juſtified*[c], &c. The Text ſpeaks plainly of a *preſent* Juſtification, or Remiſſion: For, both amount to the ſame, as I have hinted before. St. *Paul* ſpeaks of ſincere Converts, as *being juſtified freely by God's Grace, thro' the Redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt*[d]; and ſoon after mentions *Remiſſion of Sins paſt*[e], meaning Remiſſion *then preſent*; as indeed He could not mean any Thing elſe. In another Place, He ſpeaks of *Juſtification* as then actually received, or obtained: *Being juſtified by Faith, we have Peace with God, thro' our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* ——*by whom we have now received the Atonement*[f]. Elſewhere He ſays, *Ye are waſhed, ye are ſanctified, ye are juſtified, in the Name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God*[g]. Again: *You being dead in your Sins*

[a] *Mark* II. 5, 9. *Luke* V. 20.
[b] *John* XX. 23.
[c] *Acts* XIII. 39.
[d] *Rom.* III. 24.
[e] *Rom.* III. 25.
[f] *Rom.* V. 1, 11.
[g] 1 *Cor.* VI. 11.

CHAP. IX. —— *hath He quickned, having forgiven you all Treſpaſſes*[h]. I ſhall take notice but of one Text more: *I write unto you, little Children, becauſe your Sins are forgiven you*[i]. So then, *preſent* Remiſſion, in ſome Caſes or Circumſtances, may be juſtly looked upon as a *clear* Point. Nevertheleſs, we are to underſtand it in a Senſe conſiſtent with what St. *Paul* teaches elſewhere: *We are made Partakers of Chriſt* (finally) *if we hold the Beginning of our Confidence ſtedfaſt unto the End*[k]. There is a diſtinction to be made between *preſent*, and *final* Juſtification: Not that one is *conditional* and the other *abſolute* (for Both are *abſolute* in their kind, being founded in *abſolute* Grants) but in one Caſe, the Party may live long enough to *need* a *new* Grant, in the other He is ſet beyond all danger, or doubtfulneſs. *Preſent* Juſtification amounts to a preſent *Right* or *Claim* to Heaven upon Goſpel-Terms, and pre-ſuppoſes the Performance of *every Thing ſtipulated*, ſo far, and is therefore *abſolute* for the Time being[l]. As to *future* Perſeverance, becauſe it is *future*, it comes not into *preſent* Account, and ſo is out

[h] *Coloſſ.* II. 13.
[i] 1 *John* II. 12.
[k] *Heb.* III. 14.
[l] Hic dico, quod notandum eſt, quemvis juſtificatum præſtitiſſe *integram* Fœderis Evangelici conditionem, *pro ſtatu in quo eſt*. Quiſquis Fide in Chriſtum δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένης præditus eſt, is *eo momento* præſtitit *integram* Fœderis Evangelici *conditionem* quæ, in *ſtatu in quo eſt*, ab ipſo requiritur, etiamſi jugis & pia operatio adhuc deſit: Proinde ex Fœdere illo juſtificatur, atque ad omnia Fœderis ejuſdem Beneficia *jus* habet. *Bull.* Reſp. ad Animad. III. §. 6. p. 539.

of

of the Queſtion, as to *preſent* Juſtification[m], or *preſent* Stipulation. Perſeverance is *conditionally* ſtipulated, that is to ſay, upon the Suppoſition, or Condition that *we live longer:* But the Queſtion concerning our *preſent Claim* to Heaven upon the Goſpel-Terms, turns only upon what is *preſent*, and what ſerves for the *Time being*. A *preſent* Right is not therefore *no Right*, or *not certain* for the preſent, becauſe of its being liable to forfeiture, on ſuch and ſuch *Suppoſitions*, afterwards. This I obſerve here, to remove the Prejudices which ſome may poſſibly conceive againſt the very Notion of *preſent Remiſſion* (either in the Sacraments, or out of them) only becauſe it is not *abſolute* in every View, and upon every Suppoſition, but upon the *preſent View* only, or in the Circumſtances now preſent. Indeed, Remiſſion of Sins is a kind of *continued* Act of God towards good Men, often *repeated* in this Life, and more and more *confirmed* the more they improve; *aſcertained* to them, againſt all future Chances, at their departure hence, but not *finally*, or in the moſt *ſolemn Form* conferred, before the Day of Judgment. CHAP. IX.

3. I PROCEED to obſerve, that ſuch *preſent Remiſſion*, as I have hitherto been ſpeaking of, is ordinarily conferred in the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, where there is no Obſtacle on the Part of the Recipient. Even the Baptiſm of

[m] Hæc conditio *jugis operationis* in Evangelico fœdere non *abſolute* requiritur, ſed *ex Hypotheſi*; nempè ſi Deus vitam largitus fuerit. *Bull.* ibid.

CHAP. IX.

John, upon Repentance, inſtrumentally conveyed *Remiſſion of Sins*[n]: Much more does the Baptiſm of Chriſt. *Except a Man be born of Water, and of the Spirit, He cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*[o]. This implies, that *Water-Baptiſm*, ordinarily, is requiſite to *Remiſſion*, and conſequently is an ordinary Means of conveying it. But there are other Texts more expreſs: *Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Remiſſion of Sins* ——— *The Promiſe is* —— *to all that are afar off*[p], &c. *Ananias*'s Words to *Saul* are very remarkable: *Ariſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy Sins*[q]: Words too clear and expreſs to be eluded by any *Socinian* Evaſions. And ſo are thoſe other Words: *Chriſt alſo loved the Church, and gave Himſelf for it, that He might ſanctify and cleanſe it with the waſhing of Water by the Word*[r]. The ſame Doctrine is again taught by St. *Paul*, where He ſpeaks of the *putting off the Body of Sins, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt*[s]; by *Chriſtian Circumciſion*, that is, by Baptiſm. The ſame Thing is implied in our being *ſaved by the Laver of Regeneration*[t], and *ſaved by Baptiſm*[v], and having *Hearts ſprinkled from an evil Conſcience*[w]. It is in vain to plead

[n] *Mark* I. 4.
[o] *John* III. 5.
[p] *Acts* II. 38, 39.
[q] *Acts* XXII. 16.
[r] *Epheſ.* V. 25, 26. Compare *Pearſon* on the Creed, Article X. p. 368. 3*d* Edit.
[s] *Coloſſ.* II. 12, 13. See Dr. *Wall* Hiſt. of Inf. Bapt. Part I. c. 2. *Defence*, 269, &c.
[t] *Tit.* III. 5.
[v] 1 *Pet.* III. 21.
[w] *Heb.* X. 22.

againſt *Remiſſion of Sins* in either of the Sacraments, on account of their being conſidered in the Recipient as *ſingle Acts*: For, ſince it is *certain Fact*, that ſuch Remiſſion is conferred in and by *Baptiſm*, there muſt be ſome *fallacy* in that kind of Reaſoning, whether we can eſpy it or not, and it can be of no weight againſt plain and certain *Fact*. But I have hinted in my *Introduction*, and elſewhere [x], where the Error and Miſconception of ſuch Reaſoning lies: And I ſhall only add here, that if a King were to ſend out his general *Letters* of *Pardon* for all *ſubmiſſive* Offenders, who, after renewing their Bonds of Allegiance, would come and take out their Pardon *in certain Form*, it would be no Objection to the *validity* of their *Pardon*, as conveyed by *ſuch Form*, that the ſubmitting to it was but *part* of the *Condition*, and not the *whole*, ſo long as it *pre-ſuppoſes* every Thing beſides. I may note alſo, by the way, that no juſt Objection can be made againſt the *general* Notion of God's conferring Pardon by the *miniſtry* of Men, ſince it is certain that He does it in the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, which is adminiſtred by the Hands of Men commiſſioned thereunto. CHAP. IX.

HAVING thus diſpatched the three *previous* Propoſitions, preparatory to what I intend, I now proceed directly to the Subject of the preſent Chapter, which is to ſhew, that God confers *Remiſſion of Sins* in or by the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, as well as by the Sacra-

[x] See above Ch. VIII. p. 286.

CHAP. IX.

ment of *Baptiſm.* The *Analogy* which there is between the two Sacraments, conſidered as *Sacraments*, is it ſelf a ſtrong Preſumption of it; unleſs there were ſome very good Reaſon to be given why *Remiſſion* ſhould be granted there, and not here. The once granting of *Remiſſion* is no Argument againſt *repeating* and *renewing* it, time after time, if there may be any *new* occaſion for it, or if frequent *Renewals* may add more abundant *Strength* and *Firmneſs* to what was before done, either for greater *Security*, or greater *Conſolation.*

IT may be ſaid perhaps, that *Baptiſm* was neceſſary to give any Perſon a *Covenant-Right* to pardon upon Repentance, but that when a Man is once entred into *Covenant*, then *Repentance* alone ſuffices, and there is no longer need of ſubmitting to any other *publick*, *ſolemn Form* of Remiſſion, as an *Inſtrument* of Pardon. I allow, there is not preciſely the *ſame need*; and yet I will not preſume to maintain that there may not be *great need*, notwithſtanding. It is one Thing to ſay, that Remiſſion is given in the Euchariſt, as well as in Baptiſm; and another to ſay, that the Euchariſt is as *neceſſary* to Remiſſion, as *Baptiſm.* Baptiſm may be the *firſt* and *grand* Abſolution; and the Euchariſt may be only *ſecond* to it: The Euchariſt may be an *Inſtrument* of Remiſſion, but not the *prime* or *chief* Inſtrument. I am aware, that it was St. *Auſtin*'s Doctrine (and, I think, of the *Schools* after Him) that *Baptiſmal Remiſſion* looks not only backwards to Sins *paſt*, but forwards

wards also to *future* Transgressions, and has its *federal* Effect for Remission of Sins *repented of*, all our Lives long[y]. But yet that Consideration never hindred Him, nor others of the same Sentiments with Him, from believing, that *Remission of Sins* is granted in and by the *Eucharist*[z], as well as by the other Sacrament. Only, They might think, that Baptism is eminently and emphatically the Sacrament of *Remission*, and the other, of *Spiritual Growth*; one is more peculiarly the Instrument of *Justification*, while *Sanctification* is the eminent Privilege of the other. Nevertheless, *Justification* and *Sanctification*, tho' distinct in notion, are yet so closely connected in the Spiritual Life, that they commonly go together, and so whatever tends to increase either, increases Both. And tho' it is certainly true, that the Gospel-Covenant promises *Remission* upon *Repentance*, yet receiving the *Communion*, as it is

CHAP. IX.

[y] Sic, inquam, Hoc accipiendum est, ut eodem Lavacro Regenerationis & verbo Sanctificationis, omnia prorsus mala Hominum Regeneratorum mundentur, atque sanentur: non solum peccata quæ omnia *nunc* remittuntur in Baptismo, sed etiam quæ *posterius* humanâ ignorantiâ vel infirmitate contrahuntur. Non ut Baptisma quotiens *peccatur* totiens *repetatur*; sed quia *ipsa* quod semel datur, fit, ut non solum *antea*, verum etiam *postea* quorumlibet Peccatorum venia Fidelibus impetretur. Quid enim prodesset vel *ante Baptismum* pœnitentia, nisi Baptismus sequeretur, vel *postea*, nisi præcesserit? *Augustin.* de Nupt. & Concupisc. L. 1. p. 298. Tom. X. Ed. Bened. Conf. *Sam. Ward* Determ. Theolog. p. 57. *Vossius* de Baptism. Disp. VI. p. 277. *Turretin.* Institut. Theolog. Tom. III. p. 460. &c. *Hesychius*, of the 5*th* Century, expressed it thus: Virtus præcedentis Baptismatis operatur & in ea, quæ postea acta fuerit, pœnitentia. *In Levit.* L. II. p. 118.

[z] Vid. *Augustin.* de Peccat. Mer. & Rem. L. I. c. 24.

an

CHAP. IX.

an Article of *Chriſtian Obedience*, is included in the Notion of *Repentance*, making a Part of it, as often as we *may* and *ought* to receive. But beſides that, as *Repentance* alone, without a continual *Application* of the great *Atonement*, is of no avail upon the foot of the *Chriſtian Covenant*, nor can be accepted at the Throne of Grace; the leaſt that we can ſay of the *expediency* of the Euchariſt, in that reſpect, is, that it amounts to a *publick*, *ſolemn*, *certain* Application of Chriſt's Merits, for the rendring our *Repentance* acceptable, (which no other Service except *Baptiſm* does) and therefore it is a Service carrying in it the livelieſt *Aſſurance*, and the ſtrongeſt *Conſolation*, with reſpect to that very *Remiſſion* promiſed upon our ſerious *Repentance*. Baptiſm *once* received may perhaps juſtly be ſuppoſed to carry in it the Force of ſuch *continued Application* all our Lives after: But yet it was not for nothing, that God appointed another Sacrament, ſupplemental to Baptiſm, for carrying on the ſame Thing, or for the more effectual ſecuring the ſame End. It is further to be conſidered, that if the Euchariſt includes in it (as ſhall be ſhewn in its Place) a *Renewal* of the Baptiſmal *Covenant*, it muſt of courſe be conceived to carry in it a *Renewal* of Baptiſmal *Remiſſion* alſo: And Remiſſion, on God's Part, is a kind of *continued* Act, always *growing*, always *improving*, during the ſeveral Stages and Advances of the Chriſtian Life [a]. Beſides, if divine Wiſdom, among other

[a] *Juſtificatio* & *Sanctificatio* ſunt actus quidem *perpetuus*, in quo

other Reaſons, has ſuperadded the *Solemnity* of Baptiſm to *Repentance*, in order to fix the Repentance more ſtrongly, and to render it accepted, as alſo to make the *Pardon* therein granted, the more affecting and memorable; it is obvious to perceive how the Solemnity of the Euchariſt is fitted to ſerve the like Purpoſes; and is therefore the more likely to have been intended for another *publick* and *ſenſible* Application of the *Merits* of Chriſt's Death, and a Channel of *Remiſſion* [b], ſuccedaneous to Bap- CHAP. IX.

quo & Deus *ſemper donat*, & Homo *ſemper recipit*. Totâ itaque vitâ Homo fidelis poſcit *Remiſſionem* peccatorum, & *Renovationem* ſui: Totâ item vitâ utrumque impetrat. Habet *antè*, ſed conſequitur tum *conſervationem* tum *Incrementum* ejus quod habet. Omnibus credentibus opus, ut tum *Fides* tum *Gratia* fide percepta foveatur, alatur, augeatur. Omnibus igitur Credentibus & *verbi*, & *Sacramentorum* adminiculo opus eſt, &c. *Voſſius* de Sacr. vi & effic. p. 252.

[b] "By the ſame Reaſon that it came to be thought needful "to make uſe of *ſenſible* Means to *convey* or *aſſure* to Mankind "God's *Pardon* and Grace upon their *firſt Converſion* to Chri- "ſtianity, by the ſame, or a greater Reaſon, it muſt be judged "to be ſo, to make uſe of the like *ſenſible* Means to *convey* or "*aſſure* the ſame Grace and *Pardon*, after Men have in any mea- "ſure *forfeited* the Intereſt they had in the other.

"By the ſame Reaſon again, that it came to be thought need- "ful to exact of us *ſenſible* Declarations of our renouncing the "Errors of our *unconverted* State ——— by the ſame, or a "greater Reaſon, muſt it be judged to be ſo, to exact of us the "like *ſenſible* Declarations, after we have, by our Diſobedience, "departed from, and prevaricated our former ones. *Towerſon* on the Sacrament, p. 158.

The Author here reſolves the Reaſon of granting *Remiſſion* by the Euchariſt, into the expediency of *ſenſible* means to teſtify *Repentance* on Man's Part, for Sins committed after Baptiſm, and for the greater *Solemnity* of granting *Pardon*, on God's Part. Which appears to be a very juſt Account of it, in part, or it is, at leaſt, a ſufficient Anſwer to Objections drawn from the *Rationale* of the Thing.

tiſm,

CHAP. IX.

tiſm, in ſome Views, and ſo far ſerving inſtead of a *Repetition* of it. But whether we are right or wrong in theſe and the like plauſible Reaſonings upon the *Analogy* of the two Sacraments, or upon their common, or diſtinct uſes, yet if we can *prove* the Fact, that the Euchariſt really is an *Inſtrument* of *Remiſſion*, or a *Goſpel-Form* of *Abſolution*, we need not then concern ourſelves much about the *Rationale* of the Thing: Our poſitive Proofs will be ſufficient without it. This then is what I ſhall now proceed to, following the Light of *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*.

1. THAT *Remiſſion* of *Sins* is ordinarily conferred in the Euchariſt, follows undeniably from the Doctrine of 1 *Cor.* X. 16. as explained in the preceding Chapter of this Work. For, if we are therein *Partakers* of Chriſt's Death, with the *Fruits* thereof; and if the *Atonement* be one of thoſe Fruits, and indeed the *firſt* and *principal*; and if *Remiſſion* follows the Atonement, wherever it is truly *applied*; it is manifeſt from theſe Conſiderations taken together, that *Remiſſion* is *conferred* or (which comes to the ſame) *renewed* and *confirmed* in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. This Argument is built upon a very clear and allowed Maxim, that the *Effect* muſt anſwer to the *Cauſe*, and the *Fruits* to the *Stock* from whence they grow [c]. Beſides, to deny that the Euchariſt carries *Remiſſion* with it, ſeems to make it rather a *Memorial* of the *Reconcilement*, than an actual *Participation* of it:

[c] See Dr. *Pelling* Diſc. on the Sacrament, p. 138. &c.

Which is what the *Socinians* do indeed teach, but have been confuted (if I may take leave to ſay ſo) in the foregoing Chapters. CHAP. IX.

2. I GO on to our Lord's own Words in the Inſtitution. *Drink ye all of This: For This is my Blood, the Blood of the new Covenant, ſhed for you, and for many,* FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS. Our Lord here mentions the *Remiſſion of Sins* as the Effect or Fruit of the *Blood ſhed:* That very *Blood ſhed* is what we *Symbolically* drink in the Euchariſt, together with the *Fruits* of it, as hath been abundantly proved above: Therefore we drink *Remiſſion* in the Euchariſt, which is one of thoſe *Fruits.* To inforce the Argument, obſerve but with what Emphaſis our Lord ſays, *Drink ye all of This; For, This is* &c. Why ſuch a Streſs laid upon *drinking* this Blood *ſhed for Remiſſion,* if They were not to *drink Remiſſion* in the very Act? *Commemorating* will not anſwer the Purpoſe: For, drinking is the conſtant *Symbol* of *receiving* ſomething *in,* not of commemorating, which is *paying out:* And I have often obſerved before, that *receiving* in this Inſtance, muſt, in the very nature of the Act, mean *preſent* receiving: Therefore again, the receiving, Symbolically in the Euchariſt, that *juſtifying Blood* of Chriſt, muſt of conſequence amount to receiving *preſent* Remiſſion of Sins. Bp. *Taylor* works up the Argument a little differently, thus: "The *Body* "receives the *Body* of the Myſtery (we eat and "drink the *Symbols* with our *Mouths*) but *Faith* "feeds upon the *Myſtery* it ſelf, it entertains "the

CHAP. IX.

" the *Grace*——which the Spirit of God *con-*
" *veys* under that Signature. Now, ſince the
" Myſtery is perfectly and openly expreſſed to
" be the *Remiſſion of Sins*, if the *Soul* does the
" Work of the *Soul*, as the *Body* the Work of
" the *Body*, the *Soul* receives *Remiſſion of Sins*,
" as the *Body* does the *Symbols* and the Sa-
" crament [d].

THE *Socinians* here object, that the Text does not ſay that the *Euchariſt* is ordained for Remiſſion, but that *the Blood*, the Blood ſpilled upon the Croſs, was ſhed *for Remiſſion*. But it is obvious to reply, that That Blood which was once *literally* given for *Remiſſion*, upon the Croſs, is now every Day *ſymbolically* and *myſtically* given in the Euchariſt, and given with all its *Fruits:* Therefore *Remiſſion* of *Sins* is given. Such is the nature of *Symbolical* Grants, as I have before explained at large: They *exhibit* what they *repreſent*, convey what they ſignify, and are in *divine* Conſtruction and Acceptance, tho' not literally or ſubſtantially, the very Thing which they ſupply the Place of. Which is ſo true in this Caſe, that the very Attributes of the *Signs* and Things *ſignified* are reciprocally predicated of each other: The *Body* is repreſented as *broken* [e], tho' that Attribute properly belongs to the *Bread*; and the *Cup*, by a double Figure, is ſaid to be *ſhed for you* [f], when, in ſtrictneſs of Speech, that Attribute belongs only to the *Blood*. This is further confirmed

[d] *Taylor's* Worthy Communicant, p. 51.
[e] 1 *Cor.* XI. 24. [f] *Luke* XXII. 20.

from

from the *Analogy* which there is between the *repreſentative* Blood in the Euchariſt, and the *typical* Blood of the ancient *Paſſover*. For as the *Blood* there was a *Token* of Remiſſion, and made *inſtrumental* to Remiſſion, ſo is it alſo in the *Symbolical* Blood of the Euchariſt; and thus every Thing anſwers [g]. The Blood likewiſe of the ancient Sacrifices, *prefiguring* the Blood of Chriſt, was a *Token* of a Covenant [h], and conveyed *Remiſſion* (Legal directly, and Evangelical indirectly) and therefore the Symbolical Blood of the Euchariſt *figuring* the ſame Blood of Chriſt, cannot but be underſtood to convey Remiſſion as effectually, yea and more effectually than the other, which the very *Phraſes* here made uſe of, parallel to the former, ſtrongly argue. CHAP. IX.

I SHALL only add further, that ſince there certainly is *Spiritual Manducation* in the Euchariſt, as before ſhewn, and ſince *Remiſſion of Sins*, by all Accounts, and even by the *Socinians*, is allowed to be *included* in Spiritual Manducation; it will plainly follow, that *Remiſſion of Sins* is conveyed in and by the Euchariſt; which was to be proved.

HAVING thus far argued the Point from Scripture-Principles, I may now proceed to enquire what additional Light may be borrowed from *Authorities*, ancient or modern. I ſhall draw together a ſummary Account of what the

[g] See above Ch. II. p. 69, 70.

[h] *Exod.* XXIV. 8. See *Nature and Obligation of the Chriſtian Sacraments*. p. 86.

Primi-

CHAP. IX.

Primitive Churches taught in this Article; and ſhall afterwards conſider, very briefly, the Doctrine of our own Church on the ſame Head.

THE learned Author of the *Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church*, having previouſly obſerv'd of *Baptiſm*, that it was eſteemed *the Grand Abſolution* of all, proceeds ſoon after to take notice of the *Abſolution* granted in the *Euchariſt*, and gives this general Account of it.

" IT had ſome relation to *Penitential Diſci-*
" *pline*, but did not *ſolely* belong to it. For,
" it was given to all *baptized* Perſons who ne-
" ver fell under *penitential* Diſcipline, as well
" as to thoſe who *lapſed* and were reſtored to
" Communion: And in Both reſpects, it was
" called the τὸ τέλειον, the *Perfection*, or *Con-*
" *ſummation* of a Chriſtian; there being no
" higher Myſtery that an ordinary Chriſtian
" could partake of. To thoſe who never fell
" into ſuch *great Sins* as required a publick
" *Penance*, it was an *Abſolution* from *leſſer* Sins,
" which were called *venial*, and Sins of *daily*
" *Incurſion*: And to Penitents who had *lapſed*,
" it was an *Abſolution* from thoſe *greater Sins*
" for which they were fallen under Cenſure[i].

To this may be added, that the Name of Ἐφόδιον, *Viaticum*, which means *Proviſion for ones Journey into the other World*, and which was frequently given to the Euchariſt, in the fourth Century[k], and ſo on, is a *general* Proof of the Senſe

[i] *Bingham.* B. XIX. c. 1.

[k] Teſtimonies are collected by *Caſaubon.* Exercit N, 52. p. 415.

Suicer.

Senſe of the Church in thoſe Times with reſpect to *Remiſſion* in the *Holy Communion*: For, as that Name imports more, ſo it certainly implies *Remiſſion of Sins*, as part of the Idea belonging to it. CHAP. IX.

AFTER this brief general Account, let us come to Particulars. The elder Fathers, of the two firſt Centuries (ſo far as I have obſerved) make not expreſs mention of *Remiſſion* of *Sins* in the *Euchariſt*, tho' They are explicite enough with reſpect to *Baptiſm*. Their common way, with regard to the Euchariſt, was to paſs over *Remiſſion*, and to go higher up to *Sanctification* of the Spirit, and *ſpiritual* or *myſtical* Union with Chriſt, and the conſequent Right to *Glory*, and *Immortality*, and *eternal Life*. Perhaps, They might conceive it low and diminutive, in that Caſe, to ſpeak at all of *Remiſſion*, which was but the *initiatory* Part, and belonged more peculiarly to the *Initiatory* Sacrament, which in thoſe Times, and in the Caſe of Adults, immediately preceded the other. However that were, we find [k] Proofs ſufficient from the Writers of the Third Century, that the Euchariſt was thought to be of a *propitiatory* Nature, in virtue of the great *Sacrifice* therein *commemorated*: And tho' the elder Fathers do not directly ſay ſo, They tacitely ſuppoſed or inſinuated the ſame Thing, by their ſtanding *Diſcipline*, and by their ſo often calling the Euchariſt a *Sacrifice* well-pleaſing to

[k] *Suicer.* in Ἐπίκλησις. p. 1290.
Bingham. B. XV. c. IV. § 9. B. XVIII. c. 4 § 3.
Mabillon. de Liturg. Gall. p. 85.

CHAP. IX.

God: Beſides that the *Sanctification* which they do ſpeak of, as conferred in the Euchariſt, *implied* Remiſſion of Sins, either as then *granted*, or at leaſt then *confirmed* and *eſtabliſhed*.

Origen is one that ſpeaks plainly of the *propitiatory* Nature of the Euchariſt [1]; underſtanding it in a qualified Senſe, as being propitiatory only in virtue of the grand Sacrifice, or as all *acceptable* Services are, in ſome Senſe, appeaſing, and pacificatory.

Cyprian, of the ſame Time, takes notice of the Sacramental *Cup* as relieving the *ſad* and *ſorrowful* Heart, before oppreſſed with the *Anguiſh of Sins*, and now overjoyed with a Senſe of the *divine Indulgence* [m]. From which Words it is manifeſt, that it was *God's Pardon* (not merely the *Church's* Reconciliation) which was ſuppoſed to be conveyed in and by the Euchariſt; which is farther evident from the noted Story of *Dionyſius* Bp. of *Alexandria*, his ſending the Euchariſt to *Serapion* at the point of Death, and the Reflexions which He made upon it, as being inſtrumental towards the *wiping out his Sins* before his departure [n]. Such was the prevailing Notion of that Time in relation to *Remiſſion* of *Sins*, as conferred in the

[1] Si reſpicias ad commemorationem de qua dicit Dominus, *Hoc facite in meam Commemorationem*, invenies, quod iſta eſt commemoratio ſola quæ *propitium* facit Hominibus Deum. *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. XIII. p. 255.

[m] Epotato Sanguine Domini, mœſtum pectus ac triſte, quod prius *peccatis angentibus* premebatur, *divinæ indulgentiæ* lætitia reſolvatur: Quod tum demum poteſt lætificare in eccleſia Domini bibentem &c. *Cypr.* Ep. 63. p. 107. alias 153.

[n] Vid. *Euſeb.* E. H. L. VI. c. 44. p. 318.

Euchariſt.

Euchariſt. " Some ancient Writers (I uſe the
" Words of Mr. *Bingham*) acknowledge no
" other Sorts of *Abſolution* but only Two; the
" *Baptiſmal* Abſolution which is antecedent
" to all *penitential* Diſcipline, and This of re-
" conciling publick Penitents to the *Commu-*
" *nion* of the *Altar:* Becauſe this latter *compre-*
" *hends* all *other* ways of *Abſolution*, in the ſe-
" veral Acts and Ceremonies that were uſed
" in conferring it [o]. Another very learned
Writer has made the like Obſervation, in the
Words here following: " They that have with
" the greateſt diligence ſearched into *Antiquity*,
" can diſcover no other *Rite* or *Solemnity* uſed
" upon this occaſion, but barely the admitting
" the *Penitents* to *Communion:* By this they
" were entirely *acquitted* and *abſolved* from
" the Cenſure under which their Crimes had
" laid them: By this their *Sins were remitted*
" *to them*, and ſo they became once more
" *Fellow-Citizens* with the *Saints*, and of the
" Houſhold of God [p].

CHAP. IX.

For the Fourth Century, *Euſebius* may be an Evidence to prove the Doctrine of *Remiſſion* in and by the *Euchariſt*, where He ſays: " We moreover offer the *Shew-Bread*, while
" we revive the *ſalútary Memorial* and the
" Blood of ſprinkling of the Lamb of God
" (that taketh away the Sins of the World)

[o] *Bingham*. B. XIX. c. 1. §6.

[p] *Johnſon*. Unbloody Sacrif. Part II. p. 210. Compare p. 107. And Part I. p. 284. &c. Conf. *Morin*. de Pœnitent. L. IV. c. 21, 22.

CHAP. IX. "the *purgative* of our Souls [q]. He ſeems here to underſtand the *Blood* of Chriſt as making the Purgation *directly*, and the ſalutary Memorial as doing it *indirectly*, and in virtue of the other. He ſpeaks plainer elſewhere, directly ſaying, that Chriſtians receive *Remiſſion of Sins* in the daily *Memorial* which they celebrate, *viz.* the Memorial of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood* [r].

Cyril of the ſame Century ſtyles the Euchariſt the *Sacrifice of Propitiation* [s], (in ſuch a Senſe as I have before hinted with relation to *Origen*) and He ſuppoſes it to be offered in order to render God *propitious*, which amounts to the ſame as if He had ſaid, for *Remiſſion of Sins* [t].

Ephræm Syrus of the ſame Age ſuppoſes that the Euchariſt *purifies* the *Soul* from its *Spots*, that is, from its *Sins* [u]. And *Ambroſe* [w] ſcruples not to aſcribe to the Bread conſecrated *Remiſſion of*

[q] Αλλὰ καὶ νῦν ἄρτος ὁ προσφερόμενος, ἢ σωτήριον μυήμιλω ζωπυροῦντες, τό τε τοῦ φανησομένου αἷμα τὸ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ἀφιελόντος ἡ ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, καθαίρσιον τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν. *Euſeb.* in Pſalm. 91. p. 608.

[r] Διὰ τὴν ἐνδεᾶ καὶ μυστικῆς διδασκαλίας πάντες ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτημάτων εὑρήμεθα ——— εἰκότως τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ὁσημέρας ὑπιτελοῦντες. κ. τ. λ. *Euſeb.* Demonſtr. Evang. L. 2. c. 10. p. 37.

[s] Τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ. *Cyrill.* Myſtag. V. § 8. p. 327. conf. *Deylingius* Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 155, &c.

[t] Χειρὸν ἐξιλασμένον προσφέρομεν, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν, ἐξιλεούμενοι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν τοῦ φιλανθρώπου θεόν. *Cyrill.* Myſtag. V. § 10. p. 328.

[u] Animæ accedentes per illa tremenda myſteria *macularum purificationem* accipiunt. *Ephr. Syr.* de Sacerdotio. p. 3.

[w] *Ego ſum panis vitæ*; etiamſi quis mortuus fuerit, tamen ſi panem meum *acceperit*, vivet in æternum: Ille enim *accipit* qui *ſeipſum probat*. Qui autem accipit, non moritur Peccatoris morte; quia panis hic *Remiſſio peccatorum* eſt. *Ambroſ.* de Benedict. Patriarch. c. IX. p. 525.

Sins;

Sins; which is to be underſtood with ſome Allowance for a figurative way of ſpeaking. He ſpeaks indeed of the *living Bread*, that is, of Chriſt Himſelf, but conſidered as Symbolically received in the *Euchariſt*; which is manifeſt from his referring to 1 *Cor.* XI. 28. *Let a Man examine Himſelf.* CHAP. IX.

St. *Auſtin* appears to have been in the ſame Sentiments exactly: Where ſpeaking of the Grand Sacrifice, by which alone *true Remiſſion*[x] comes, He immediately adds, that all Chriſtians are *invited* to *drink* the *Blood* of it, meaning in the Euchariſt.

ALL the ancient *Liturgies* are full of the ſame Notion of *Remiſſion* of *Sins* conferred in this Sacrament. And tho' they are moſtly *ſpurious*, or *interpolated*, and anſwer not ſtrictly to the *Names* which they commonly bear, yet ſome of them have been in uſe for many Centuries upwards in the *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Oriental* Churches, and are a good Proof of the *univerſality* of a Doctrine for the Time they obtained. The *Clementine*, tho' it is not thought to have been ever in publick uſe, is commonly believed to be the *oldeſt* of any now extant: And tho' as an entire Collection, it cannot perhaps be juſtly ſet higher than the V*th* Century, yet it certainly contains many Things

[x] Illis Sacrificiis hoc *unum Sacrificium* ſignificabatur, in quo *vera* fit *Remiſſio peccatorum*. A cujus tamen Sacrificii Sanguine non ſolum nemo prohibetur, ſed ad *bibendum* potius *omnes* exhortantur qui volunt habere vitam. *Auguſtin.* in Levit. Tom. III. p. 516, 517. conf. *Damaſcen.* de Fid. L. IV. c. 13. p. 271.

CHAP. IX. derived from earlier Times, and among thoſe, probably, the Doctrine of *Euchariſtical Remiſſion*. In that *Liturgy*, Prayer is made, that the Holy Spirit may ſo bleſs the Elements, that the Communicants may *obtain Remiſſion of Sins* [y]. And in the *Poſt-Communion*, Prayer is again made that the receiving of the Euchariſt may turn to *Salvation*, not *Condemnation*, to the Benefit both of Body and Soul, to the preſerving true Piety, and to *Remiſſion of Sins* [z].

CONFORMABLE to this Pattern are the *later Liturgies*: Particularly, That which is called *Baſil*'s according to the *Alexandrian* uſe, in *Renaudot*'s Edition [a]. And another, entituled *Gregory*'s Liturgy [b]. The ſame Thing is obſervable in the *Liturgies* which go under the Names of Apoſtles or Evangeliſts, collected by *Fabricius*: As St. *James*'s [c], St. *Peter*'s [d], St. *Matthew*'s [e], St. *Mark*'s [f], and St. *John*'s [g]. The Liturgy under the Name of *Chryſoſtom*, publiſh'd by *Goar*, has the like Forms [h]. So alſo have the *Oriental* Liturgies in *Renaudotius*'s Collection,

[y] Ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες ἀυτῦ —— ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, &c. Apoſtol. Conſt. L. VIII. c. 12. p. 407.

[z] Καὶ παρακαλέσωμεν μὴ εἰς κρίμα, ἀλλ' εἰς σωτηρίαν ἡμῖν γινέσθαι, εἰς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, εἰς φυλακὴν εὐσεβείας, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. κ. τ. λ. Apoſt. Conſtit. L. VIII. c. 14. p. 410.

[a] *Baſil. Liturg. Alex.* p. 61. 69. 71. Apud. *Renaud.* Vol. I.

[b] *Gregorii Liturg.* p. 92. 95. 98. 106.

[c] *Jacob. Liturg.* p. 38. 41. 68. 71. 72. 86. 101. 111. 113. 120.

[d] *Petri Liturg.* p. 175. 195.

[e] *Matth. Liturg.* p. 216. 245. 248.

[f] *Marci Liturg.* p. 261. 299. 315. 316.

[g] *Johannis Liturg.* p. 203.

[h] *Goar.* Euchol. p. 77. 80. 82.

Volume the 2*d*, and the *Latin* ones publiſhed by *Mabillon*; of which it would be tedious here to ſpeak more particularly; as it is alſo needleſs to trouble the Reader with more References in a very clear Point. Upon the whole, there appears to have been a *general* conſent of the Chriſtian Churches all along as to the Point of *Euchariſtical Remiſſion* of Sins: Which is proved, not only from the Teſtimonies of *ſingle* Fathers, but from the ancient ſtanding *Diſcipline* of the Church, and from the concurring Language of all the ancient *Liturgies* now extant. CHAP. IX.

As to the Judgment of the *Firſt Reformers* abroad, it is well known to fall in with the ſame: Or if any doubt ſhould be, let *Luther* anſwer for the Lutherans [i], and for the Calviniſts *Calvin* [k].

THE Judgment of our own Church will eaſily be proved to concur in the ſame Article, from the known Language of our *Communion-*

[i] Pertinet huc Pulcherrima Gradatio *Lutheri:* "Calix Eucharisticus continet vinum: Vinum *exhibet* Chriſti Sanguinem: Sanguis Chriſti complectitur *Novum Teſtamentum*, quia "eſt Novi Teſtamenti Sanguis: Novum Teſtamentum continet "*Remiſſionem Peccatorum.* Ergo, Bibitio ex Calice Euchariſtico "*applicat, obſignat,* & *confirmat* credentibus, Promiſſionem de "*Remiſſione Peccatorum.*——

Sacramentum illud ipſum quod ſignat, etiam confert, & exhibet. *Gerhard.* Loc. Comm. de Sacr. Cœna c. XX. p. 178.

[k] Chriſti conſilium fuit, Corpus ſuum *ſub Pane* edendum porrigere in *Remiſſionem* Peccatorum. *Calvin.* Admonit. ult. ad Weſtphal. p. 950. conf. *Inſtit.* L. IV. c. 17. § 42.

Lambertus Danæus cautiouſly words the Doctrine thus: *Cœna Domini*——eſt *Applicatio* ſemel a Chriſto factæ peccatorum noſtrorum Remiſſionis. *Epiſt. ad Eccleſ. Gallican.* 1498.——

CHAP. IX.

Office, and *Homilies*. In our publick Service, we pray, that our *ſinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls waſhed thro' his moſt precious Blood*. The Propoſitions couched under theſe Words, are ſeveral: 1. That our Bodies are the *Temple* of the Holy Ghoſt. 2. That Sin *defileth* them. 3. That the *Sacrifice* of Chriſt, removing *Guilt* (other due Circumſtances ſuppoſed) makes them *clean*. 4. That there is an *Application* of that Sacrifice made in the Euchariſt. 5. That therefore ſuch Application ought to be prayed for. So much for the *Body*. The like, with a little Change, may be underſtood alſo of the *Soul:* And the Concluſion from both Parts is, that *Guilt* is waſhed away in the Sacrament, *duly* adminiſtred and duly received, both from *Body* and *Soul*; which in other Words amounteth to this, that *Remiſſion of Sins* is conferred by the Euchariſt, to all *worthy* Receivers.

IN a *Thankſgiving-Prayer*, of the ſame Service, we pray, that *we and all thy whole Church may obtain Remiſſion of Sins*,, beſeeching the divine Majeſty, not to *weigh our Merits*, but to *pardon our Offences*, &c. which Words carry in them a manifeſt Alluſion to that *Remiſſion* of *Sins* which is conceived ordinarily to pertain to this Sacrament, and is expected from it, as one of the Benefits of it. But conſidering that all depends upon our being *Meet-Partakers*, (whereof God only is the unerring Judge) and that it becomes every Communicant to think *humbly* of Himſelf, leaning to the *modeſt* Side;

it

it is very proper to refer the whole to God's Clemency, intreating Him to accept of us as *meet* Partakers, and thereupon to grant us the *Remiſſion* we came for. For, tho' it is an undoubted Truth, that the Euchariſt confers *Remiſſion* to the *faithful* Communicant, yet it is right to leave the determination of our *Faithfulneſs* to God the ſearcher of Hearts, and in the mean while to beg *forgiveneſs* at his Hands. Add to this, that were we ever ſo *certain* that we are *actually* pardoned upon receiving the Euchariſt, yet as Remiſſion is a *continued* Act, and always *progreſſive* (which I before noted) it can never be improper to go on with our Petitions for it, any more than to make uſe of the *Lord's Prayer* every Hour of our Lives. It was ſo uſed anciently, juſt after *plenary* Remiſſion[1]: And in like manner we now make uſe of it, immediately after our having received the *Communion*; without the leaſt Apprehenſion that ſuch uſage interferes at all with the Principle which I have been maintaining, as indeed it does not. Nothing is

CHAP. IX.

[1] *Jerome*'s Remark upon this Caſe, when *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt* went together, and *perfect Remiſſion* was ſuppoſed to have been juſt granted, is worth noting.

De *Baptiſmatis Fonte* ſurgentes, & regenerati in Dominum Salvatorem — ſtatim in *prima Communione* Corporis Chriſti dicunt: *Et dimitte nobis debita noſtra*, quæ illis fuerant in Chriſti confeſſione dimiſſa. ——— Quamvis ſit Hominum *perfecta converſio*, & poſt vitia atque peccata virtutum *plena poſſeſſio*; numquid poſſunt ſic eſſe *ſine vitio*, quomodo illi qui *ſtatim* de Chriſti *Fonte* procedunt? Et tamen jubentur dicere, *dimitte nobis debita noſtra*, &c. Non Humilitatis *mendacio*, ut Tu interpretaris; ſed *Pavore* Fragilitatis humanæ, ſuam conſcientiam formidantis. *Hieronym.* Dialog. adv. Pelag. L. III. p. 543.

more

CHAP. IX. more frequent in the ancient *Liturgies*, than to ask *Forgiveneſs* immediately after *receiving*, tho' the Doctrine of *preſent* Remiſſion is fully expreſſed and inculcated in the *ſame* Liturgies[m].

ENOUGH hath been ſaid to ſhew, that our *Communion-Office* ſuppoſes *Remiſſion* of *Sins* to be conferred in the Euchariſt. The ſame Thing is directly and clearly aſſerted in our *Homilies*. "As to the number of *Sacraments*, if they "ſhould be conſidered according to the exact "Signification of a *Sacrament*, namely, for vi- "ſible Signs expreſsly commanded in the New "Teſtament, whereunto is annexed the Pro- "miſe of *free Forgiveneſs of Sins*, and of our "Holineſs, and joyning in Chriſt, there be "but Two, namely, *Baptiſm* and the *Supper* "*of the Lord*[n]. Here, it is not only ſuppoſed that *Remiſſion* is conferred in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, but that it could not in ſtrictneſs be reputed a *Sacrament*, if it were not ſo: So great a Streſs is there laid on this Principle. Accordingly, afterwards in the *ſame* Homily, *Abſolution* is rejected as *no Sacrament*, having no ſuch Promiſe of Remiſſion *annexed* and *tied* to the *viſible Sign*: And *Orders* alſo is rejected, becauſe it *lacks the Promiſe of Re-*

[m] See the *Clementine* Liturgy quoted above. And compare *Fabricius*'s Collection, p. 120, 333. *Renaudot*'s Vol. I. p. 51. Vol. II. p. 42, 152, 174, 212, 233, 253, 269, 447, 634. *Mabillon*'s in Muſ. Ital. Vol. I. p. 281. Miſſal. Gall. p. 331. Liturg. Gallic. p. 300.

[n] *Homily* IX. of Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 374. Compare *Cranmer*, p. 46.

miſſion

miſſion of Sin. In another *Homily*, where the *Lord's Supper* is particularly treated of, it is obſerved, that therein "the favourable Mercies "of God are *ſealed*, the Satisfaction by Chriſt "towards us confirmed, and the *Remiſſion of* "*Sins eſtabliſhed*[o].

CHAP. IX.

AFTER theſe publick, authentick Evidences of the Doctrine of our Church in this Particular, it will be needleſs to add the concurring Sentiments of our *eminent Divines*, all along from that Time. But becauſe the Point has been ſometimes conteſted, both abroad and at Home, and Difficulties have been raiſed, it will be but fair and juſt to the Reader, to ſet before Him the utmoſt that has been pleaded on the contrary Side, and to ſuggeſt, as briefly as may be, the proper Solutions of the appearing Difficulties.

OBJECTIONS *removed.*

1. IT has been objected, that "The Sacra-"ment of the *Lord's Supper* is not it ſelf like "*Baptiſm*, a Rite appointed for the *Remiſſion* "*of Sins*; but it is a *Commemoration* only of "the all-ſufficient Sacrifice, which was once

[o] *Homily* on the worthy receiving, &c. Part I. p. 471. The *Reformatio Legum*, of the ſame Time, ſays thus: *Euchariſtia* Sacramentum eſt, in quo Cibum ex pane ſumunt, & Potum ex vino, qui convivæ ſedent in *ſacra* Domini *menſa:* Cujus panis, inter illos, & vini communicatione, *obſignatur* Gratia Spiritus Sancti, *Veniaque Peccatorum*, ad quam ex eo perveniunt, quod *Fide* comprehendunt & percipiunt Chriſti Sacroſanctum *Corpus*, reſpectu noſtræ ſalutis ad crucem fixum, & *cruorem* pro *tollendis* fuſum noſtris *peccatis*, ut Dei Promiſſa palam ipſa loquuntur. Tit. V. *de Sacrament.* c. 4. p. 29.

"offered

CHAP. IX.

" offered for an *eternal* Expiation[p]. To which I anſwer, 1. That ſuppoſing this Sacrament were not appointed at all for *Remiſſion*, it does not follow that it muſt be appointed only for *Commemoration*; becauſe it might be (as it certainly is) appointed in part, for *Sanctification* alſo. 2. Suppoſing farther, that it is not compleatly equal to *Baptiſm* in point of *Remiſſion*, yet it does not follow that it may not confer Remiſſion in *ſome meaſure*, or to an *inferior Degree*. 3. It is untruly ſuggeſted, that the Euchariſt is only a *Commemoration* of the all-ſufficient Sacrifice, ſince it moſt certainly is, as hath been proved, an *Application* of that Sacrifice to every worthy Receiver: And ſince *Remiſſion* of *Sins* is one of the *Fruits* of that Sacrifice, it muſt, it cannot but be allowed, that the Euchariſt carries *Remiſſion* in it, more or leſs, and to ſome degree or other.

2. A SECOND Objection runs thus: " To " imagine that the *Lord's Supper*, which is to " be *repeated* perpetually, has *ſuch* a Promiſe " annexed to it of taking away *all paſt Sins*, " as *Baptiſm* had, which was to be adminiſtred " but *once*, is a dangerous and fatal Error, be- " cauſe ſuch an Opinion would be plainly an " *Encouragement* for Men to *continue* in Sin, " that the *Grace* of forgiveneſs might be per- " petually *repeated* and *abound*[q]. In anſwer hereto, let but the Reader put *Repentance* inſtead of *Lord's Supper*, and then traverſe the Obje-

[p] Dr. *Clarke's* Poſth. Sermons, Vol. IV. Serm. 6. p. 133.
[q] Dr. *Clarke*, ibid. p. 134.

ction

ction over again in his Mind, if it be only to see whether the very ſame Objection does not plead as ſtrongly againſt repeated *forgiveneſs* upon repeated *Repentance*, as againſt the ſame forgiveneſs upon repeated *Communion:* For, we never ſuppoſe any *new* forgiveneſs granted in the Communion, but upon *new* Repentance. What then have we to truſt to, if the plain and comfortable Goſpel-Doctrine of *Forgiveneſs (toties quoties)* upon *true* Repentance, ſhall be repreſented as a *dangerous* and *fatal* Error, and an *Encouragement* to *continue* in Sins, that *Grace* may abound? It may be true, that ſuch merciful Doctrine of *forgiveneſs* may carry ſome *Appearance* of *Encouragement* to Sin: So do ſome other Goſpel-Doctrines; or elſe St. *Paul* would have had no need to caution us againſt *continuing in Sin, that Grace may abound*[1]: But nevertheleſs, it would not only be great Preſumption, but a fatal *Error*, to draw any ſuch Inference from the Doctrine of *repeated* forgiveneſs upon *repeated* Repentance. For, what would have been the Conſequence, ſuppoſing that the Rule had run, that, if a Man ſins *once*, or *twice*, or a *Hundred*, or a *Thouſand* Times, and repent as *often*, He ſhall be *forgiven?* Would not many have been tempted to *ſin on*, till they come very near to the utmoſt verge of Forgiveneſs, before they would think of repenting to purpoſe? And what Scruples might they not raiſe about the *number* of *Sins*, or of *Repentances?* And if any Man

CHAP. IX.

[1] *Rom.* VI. 1, 2.

ſhould

CHAP. IX.

ſhould once go beyond the *Limits* now ſuppoſed to be aſſigned, what would then remain but *black Deſpair*, and a harden'd Reſolution to *continue* in *Sin?* Therefore divine Wiſdom has mercifully fix'd this Matter upon a much better foot, namely, upon one plain Rule, that *as often* as Men *ſin*, and truly *repent* (without Limitation, or Number) *ſo often* they ſhall be forgiven. When evil Habits have much and long prevailed, Repentance, however *ſincere*, will hardly be compleated *at once:* But the ordinary method is, to repent again and again, after every Relapſe, till by degrees a Man gains the entire maſtery over his Appetites and Paſſions. In this way, his Relapſes will grow *leſs frequent*, and evil Habits *leſs prevalent*, and every new Repentance will be ſtronger and ſtronger, till at length by God's Grace, and his own hearty Endeavours, He gets the Victory, and becomes confirmed in all Virtue and Godlineſs. By this we may perceive the Uſe and Benefit of frequent forgiveneſs upon frequent Repentances, in a degree ſuitable and proportionate; that Sinners may never want Encouragement to go on *repenting* more and more, after their *Relapſes*, and as often ſealing their ſincere Repentances in the bleſſed Sacrament, to make them the more ſolemn, and the more enduring. But, in the mean while, let Sinners beware how they tempt the divine goodneſs too far, by relapſing: For even *Repentance*, as depending on divine *Grace*, is ſo far in God's Hands, as well as *Par-*

don: And they who preſume to *ſin often*, because they may be *often forgiven*, are in a likely way to come to an *end* of *forgiveneſs*, before they make an *end* of *ſinning*, and to be taken, at length, in their own Snares[s]. CHAP. IX.

NOTWITHSTANDING what I have here ſaid, with reſpect to Euchariſtical Abſolution, I would not be conſtrued to mean, that there is *no difference at all*, in point of Remiſſion, between *Baptiſm* and the *Euchariſt:* For, I am aware, that there is *ſome* difference, and perhaps *conſiderable*. I ſhall here draw from the *Ancients*, and ſhall endeavour to point out the *difference* as clearly and exactly as I can. It was underſtood to lie in *three* Things chiefly; the *extent* of the Remiſſion, and the *certainty*, and the *perfection* of it.

BAPTISM was conceived to amount to a *plenary* and *certain* Indulgence for *all kinds* of Sins, were they ever ſo *great*; (as for inſtance, the *crucifying* of our Lord[t],) and of any *number*, were they ever ſo *many*, or ever ſo *often* repeated, provided only they were ſincerely repented of, and forſaken at the *Font:* They were from that Inſtant, *remembred no more*[v], either

[s] Abſit ut aliquis ita interpretetur, quaſi eo ſibi etiam nunc pateat ad *delinquendum*, quia patet ad *pœnitendum*; & redundantia clementiæ cœleſtis libidinem faciat humanæ Temeritatis: Nemo idcirco *deterior* ſit quia deus *melior* eſt, totiens delinquendo quotiens ignoſcitur. Cæterum, *finem evadendi* habebit, cum *offendendi* non habebit. *Tertullian* de Pœnit. c. VII. p. 120.

[t] *Cyrill. Hieroſol.* Catech. III. §. 15. p. 47. conf. *Morinus* de Pœnitent. L. III. c. 2, 3.

[v] Vid. *Theodoret.* in Jerem. XXXI. 34. p. 230.

in

CHAP. IX.

in God's Account, or the *Church*'s. But as to Sins committed after Baptiſm, if of a *grievous* kind (as *Idolatry*, *Murder*, *Adultery*) or leſs grievous, but *often* repeated, or much *aggravated* by the Circumſtances, They were judged too heinous to be *pardoned* in the *Euchariſt*, and the Men too vile to be admitted to *Communion* ever after[w]. Not that the Church preſumed to limit the *Mercies* of God, who ſearches the *Hearts*, and who could judge of the *Sincerity* of the *Repentance* of ſuch Perſons: But Church-Governors of that Time would not take upon them to *promiſe* ſuch Perſons *Peace*, upon any Profeſſions of *Repentance* whatever, but left them to God only. In ſhort, tho' they would have given *Baptiſm* to any the wickedeſt Pagans whatever, upon proper Profeſſions of Repentance, yet They would not give the *Euchariſt* to ſuch as had ſinned in like manner after Baptiſm: Which ſhews, that they made ſome difference between *Baptiſmal-Remiſſion* and the *Euchariſtical* one, in reſpect of *certainty*, and *extent*. When the ſeverity of Diſcipline afterwards relaxed a little, and *Communion* was allowed to all *Penitents*, at the Hour of Death, if not ſooner, yet they did not then pretend to be *certain*, that God would abſolve the Perſons, like as They judged with reſpect to *Baptiſmal* Abſolution[x]. Nevertheleſs, if we diſtinguiſh *juſtly* upon the two Caſes, it does not from hence follow that

[w] See *Bingham*, B. XVIII. Ch. IV. §. 4.

[x] See *Bingham*, B. XXIII. c. IV. §. 6. Compare *Marſhall*, Penit. Diſcipl. p. 111.

they

they thought of any proper *diſparity* between the two *Abſolutions* in themſelves conſidered; but ſtrictly ſpeaking, the *diſparity* was ſuppos'd to lie in the different *Malignity* of Sins committed *before* Baptiſm, and *after*. The *Remedies* might be conceived of equal Force, other Circumſtances being equal; but the *Malady* was not the ſame in both Caſes.

ANOTHER difference between *Baptiſmal* and *Euchariſtical* Remiſſion was underſtood to lie here, that the one *perfectly* wiped out all paſt Sins; the other, tho' it *healed* them, yet left ſome kind of *Blots* or *Scars* behind it[y]: On account whereof, many who were admitted to *Lay-Communion*, were yet conſidered as *blemiſhed* in ſome meaſure, and not fit to be admitted afterwards to the *Sacred Offices*[z]. No Crimes whatever committed *before* Baptiſm, and left at the Font, were thought any *Bar*, or *Blot* for the Time to come; Baptiſm waſhed all away: But the Caſe was different with reſpect to Sins of a ſcandalous Nature committed *after Baptiſm*; for neither *Repentance*, nor the *Euchariſt*, was conceived to waſh off all *Stain*. Hence, ſome made a diſtinction, upon *Pſalm* XXXII. 1. between *perfect* Remiſſion of Sin in *Baptiſm*, and the *covering* it by *Penance* and *Abſolution*[a]; that is, by the *Euchariſt*. And

[y] Vid. *Cyrill. Hieroſ.* Catech. XVIII. §. 20. p. 295. Ed. Bened. *Athanaſ.* ad Serap. Ep. IV. n. 13. p. 705. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. XL. p. 641.

[z] *Origen.* contr. Celſ. L. III. §. 51. p. 482. Bened. Edit.

[a] *Origen.* in Pſalm XXXI. p. 645. *Euſebius* in Pſalm XXXI. p. 120. & in Pſal. LXXXIV. p. 525.

CHAP. IX.

others ſeem to have thought that Sins committed before Baptiſm were perfectly blotted out, as it were, from the Book of God's Remembrance, as if they had never been, but that Sins of any *grievous* Kind committed afterwards, tho' pardoned upon Repentance, ſhould yet be *recited*, or *purged*, at the great Day [b]: A *conjectural* Preſumption, which I will not be bold to warrant.

HOWEVER, in the whole, it may be admitted, upon the Principles of *Reaſon*, *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, that the *Remiſſion* in the *Euchariſt* is not in every reſpect *equal*, or *ſimilar* to the Remiſſion in *Baptiſm*, becauſe of the *different* Circumſtances: Nevertheleſs it is certain, in the general, that there is ordinarily *Remiſſion* in Both, as there is ordinarily an *Application* of the *Merits* of Chriſt's all-ſufficient Sacrifice in Both.

I MUST now further add, that the Objection made againſt *repeated Forgiveneſs*, upon *repeated Repentance* in the Euchariſt, would have been of much greater Force than it really now is, were it not that this Holy Sacrament appears to have been appointed as the *ſtrongeſt Security* againſt thoſe very *Abuſes* which Men are prone to make of the *Divine Mercy*. The *two* principal *Abuſes* are, firſt, the putting off Repentance from day to day, fixing *no Time* for it, as it is thought to be left at large, and

[b] Vid. *Clemens Alex.* Strom. IV. num. 24. p. 633, 634. Strom. VI. p. 795.
Cyrill. Hieroſol. Catech. XV. n. 23. p. 236, 237.

to

to be acceptable at *any Time*; next, the reſting content with a *lame*, *partial*, or *unſincere* Repentance: Againſt Both which, the appointment of this Holy Sacrament is a kind of *ſtanding Proviſion*, the beſt, it may be, that the nature of the Caſe would admit of. To thoſe who are apt to *procraſtinate*, or *loyter*, it is an awakening call, obliging them the more ſtrongly to *fix* upon ſome *certain* and determinate Time for Repentance: And to the *ſuperficial* Penitents, it is a kind of ſolemn Lecture of *Sincerity* and *Carefulneſs*, under pain of being found *guilty* of trampling under foot the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt. And while it promiſes *Forgiveneſs* to all that *worthily* receive, and to none elſe, it becomes a ſtrong incitement to break off Sins without delay, and to be particularly *watchful* and *careful* for the Time to come. So far is the Doctrine of Remiſſion in the Euchariſt (when juſtly ſtated) from being any *Encouragement* to *Sin*, that it is quite the reverſe, being indeed one of the ſtrongeſt *Encouragements* to a *good Life*. But I proceed. CHAP. IX.

3. *Socinus* and his Followers appear much offended at the Doctrine of *Remiſſion* in the Euchariſt (for fear, I preſume, of admitting any *Merits* of Chriſt's Death) and they labour all poſſible ways to run it down; ſometimes *miſrepreſenting* it, ſometimes *ridiculing* it, and ſometimes putting on an Air of *grave* Reaſoning. *Socinus* himſelf was content to throw a blunt Cenſure upon it, as bordering upon *Idola-*

CHAP. IX.

try[c]. An injurious Reflection, for which there was no colour; unleſs he firſt wilfully *perverted* the meaning, and falſely charged the *Proteſtants* with the *Opus Operatum*.

Smalcius plainly put that falſe Conſtruction upon it, and then took the Handle to *ridicule* it, as if any *Remiſſion* could be extracted from the *uſe* of ſuch *common* Things as the bare *Symbols* are[d]. So ridiculous a miſtake of the Doctrine which He oppoſed, either ſhewed no quickneſs of Apprehenſion, or no Sincerity. *Schlichtingius* followed the ſame Blunder, and ſtill with greater Levity[e]: A certain Argument, that He had no ſolid Reaſons to produce on that Head. The *Racovian Catechiſm*, of the firſt *Latin* Edition (A. D. 1609.) pleaded, that a Man ought to be *ſure* of his Pardon[f] in Heaven, before He takes the Sacrament, and therefore could have *no more* Pardon to receive here: That muſt be their meaning, if They intended it for an Argument. However, the

[c] Plerique ipſorum in hiſce quidem regionibus, credunt ſe, illâ digne obeundâ, ſuorum *peccatorium veniam* & Remiſſionem conſequi: Haud valde diverſum ab eo quod *Papiſtæ* ſentiunt, qui eam propterea in Sacrificium pro vivis & mortuis transformarunt, & *Idolum* quoddam ex ea fecerunt. *Socin.* Quod. Regn. Polon. p. 701.

[d] Quis enim de ſua Carne, cum omnibus concupiſcentiis, crucifigenda cogitet, ſi *uſus panis & vini*, qui quotidie *obvius* eſt, poſſit *Remiſſionem Peccatorum*, &c. conſequi? *Smalc.* contr. Frantz. p. 333.

[e] O facilem vero & expeditam adipiſcendæ ſalutis rationem, ſi tot tantaque Bona, Micâ Panis, & Guttâ Vini poſſis conſequi. *Schlicting.* contr. Meiſner. p. 799.

[f] Qui vult digne Cœnæ Domini participare, eum *de Remiſſione* Peccatorum, ex parte Dei, *certum* ac *fide confirmatum* eſſe oportet. *Racov. Catech.* Cap. III.

Argument,

Argument, at beſt, is a very lame one. For, whatever *certainty* of that nature any Man may pretend to, it is capable of being *renew'd* and *reinforced* by repeated Aſſurances: And as we are taught *continually* to pray for *Forgiveneſs*, ſo may we receive it *continually*, both in the *Word*, and *Sacraments*; but more particularly in the *Sacraments*. In the next Edition of that *Catechiſm* (A. D. 1659.) that trifling Plea was ſtruck out, and another was ſubſtituted in its room; which is to this Effect, that *Remiſſion* cannot be conferred in the Euchariſt, becauſe *Commemoration* only, and not Remiſſion, was the *End* of that Rite by our Lord's Account of it[g]. But here the Suggeſtion is not true; for our Lord Himſelf has ſufficiently intimated (as I have before proved) that *Remiſſion of Sins* is one End of that Service, in the very Words of the *Inſtitution*[h]: And if He had not ſo plainly ſaid it, the very *Nature* of the *Act* proclaims it, taking in what St. *Paul* has taught. There are more *Ends* than one to be ſerved by the ſame Sacrament, whether it be of *Baptiſm*, or of the *Euchariſt*: And all are *conſiſtent*, becauſe *allied*, and *ſubordinate*. Not to mention that *Commemoration* it ſelf, rightly conſidered, ſtrongly infers and implies *preſent*

CHAP. IX.

[g] Cum is Finis Ritus iſtius uſurpandi ſit, ut Beneficium a Chriſto nobis præſtitum *commemoremus*, ſeu *annuntiemus*, nec *ullus alius* præter hunc ſit a Chriſto indicatus *Finis*; apparet, non eo inſtitutum eſſe ut aliquid illic *Beneficii*, aliter quam quatenus dignè obſervatus *pietatis Chriſtianæ pars eſt*, a Chriſto ſumamus. *Racov. Catech.* c. IV. §. 6. p. 230.

[h] *Matth.* XXVI. 28.

CHAP. IX.

Benefits; as I have obſerv'd above[i]. Moreover, the *Socinians* themſelves are forced to allow *other Ends* of the Sacrament, over and above the *Commemoration* of Chriſt's Death: Namely, A *Declaration* of their Communion with Chriſt their *Head*, and with their *Chriſtian* Brethren; beſides a further *Declaration* of their ſpiritual *Feeding* upon Chriſt, then and at all Times, and of their looking upon his *Death* as the *Seal* of the *Covenant*, and upon his *Doctrine* as the *Food* of the *Soul*. Now if they think themſelves at Liberty to *invent* as many *Ends* as they pleaſe, ſuch as may *ſuit* with their other Principles, why are we debarred from admitting ſuch other Ends of the Sacrament as *Scripture* plainly points out to us, and the *Reaſon* alſo of the *Thing* manifeſtly requires? From hence then it appears, that the *Socinian* Pleas in this Caſe carry more of *artificial* Management in them, than of *Truth*, or *Sobriety*.

HOWEVER, it is viſible from the laſt Citation, that one principal Drift is, to exclude *God*, and *Chriſt*, and the *Holy Spirit*, and all *divine* Influences, out of the *Sacrament*, and to make nothing more of it than a *Performance* of *Man*: And in this View, they are content to account it *a Part of Chriſtian Piety*. *Ruarus*, one of the ſhrewdeſt and learnedeſt of them, diſliked their granting ſo much, and charged them, in a Note of *Correction*[k], with an *Inconſiſtency*,

[i] See Above, p. 108.

[k] Si *pars eſt Chriſtianæ pietatis*, utique ad Juſtificationem, atque

ſiſtency, in ſaying it: Becauſe every *pious Obſervance* contributes, in ſome meaſure, towards *Remiſſion of Sins*, and they had before abſolutely denied any *Benefit* at all that way. *Schlictingius* left this Note of *Ruarus* without any *Reply*; tho' He replied to ſeveral others which went along with it: Which ſhews, either that He found it impoſſible to evade the Doctrine of *Remiſſion* in this *Sacrament*, unleſs it were at the expence of *Self-Contradiction*; or elſe, that He was willing, at length, to admit of it, provided only they may claim Remiſſion as their *due Reward* for the *Service*, and not as indulged them for the *Merits* of Chriſt's Death and Sacrifice therein commemorated. It muſt be own'd, that *Ruarus*'s Hint on that Head, was acute, and came home to the Purpoſe: For, as thoſe Men ſuppoſed *all other* Requiſites for Remiſſion to be implied in *worthy* receiving, and now added this *Part of Chriſtian Piety* to the reſt, it muſt of conſequence follow, that *Remiſſion of Sins* is granted upon it, by their own Principles. So then, in the laſt Reſult, They and We may ſeem to be nearly agreed as to the Point of *Remiſſion* in, or upon this Service; and the only remaining difference will be about the *meritorious* Cauſe of it: And that will reſolve into another *Queſtion*, diſcuſſed, in ſome meaſure, above; namely, the Queſtion

CHAP. IX.

que ita ad *Remiſſionem Peccatorum* nobis prodeſt: Quod tamen in initio quæſtionis hujus, *ſimpliciter* negatum fuit. *Ruari Notæ*, p. 27.

CHAP. IX. concerning the Value, Virtue, and Efficacy of the *Sacrifice* of Chriſt.

4. THERE is an inſidious way made uſe of, by ſome of our *Socinians*, for the undermining the Doctrine of *Remiſſion* in the Euchariſt: They depretiate the *Service*, and the *Preparation* proper to it, making Both ſo ſlight, that no Man could juſtly expect ſo divine a Grant, from ſo contemptible a Performance: "I know not, ſays one, to what Purpoſe ſo "many *ſuperſtitious* Books are written to teach "Men to *prepare* Themſelves for the *Memo-* "*rial-Supper*, when an *honeſt* Intention, and a "*reverent* Performance are ſufficient both *Pre-* "*parations* and *Qualifications* for and in all "Goſpel-Ordinances[1]. Here is no mention of *Faith*, nor of *Repentance* from dead Works; without which, undoubtedly, there can be no *Remiſſion* of *Sins*, whether in the Sacrament, or out of it. The proper Anſwer to this Pretence will fall under the Head of *worthy* receiving, in a diſtinct Chapter below. In the mean while, let it be conſidered, whether They who require *ſincere Repentance* as a neceſſary Qualification for the *Holy Communion*, or They who labour to defeat that moſt excellent *End* and *Uſe* of it, do moſt conſult the *true* Intereſt of *Religion* and *Virtue*; which the *Socinians* would be thought much to befriend in what They teach on this Head.

[1] The Argument of the *Unitarians* with the *Catholick* Church, Part I. p. 12. printed A. D. 1697.

I INTENDED

CHAP. IX.

I INTENDED here to have cloſed this *Chapter*, till it came into my Mind that we have had ſome kind of diſpute with the *Romaniſts* alſo (as well as *Socinians*) upon the Point of *Remiſſion* in the Euchariſt. For, the *Romaniſts*, as it ſeems, being apprehenſive, that if the People be taught to expect *Pardon* from *God* in receiving the *Communion*, They will think they need no other, and that thereupon *Maſſes*, and *Indulgences*, and other *Abſolutions* will ſink in their *value*; I ſay, the *Romaniſts* conſidering this, have contrived, that *venial* Sins only ſhall be *pardoned* upon reception of the *Euchariſt*, but that *mortal Sins* ſhall be remitted another way. *Chemnitius*, in his *Examen*, has taken notice of this matter, and charged it upon them with very little Ceremony [m]. *Bellarmin*, in reply, could not deny the main Charge, as to their confining the Euchariſtical Remiſſion to *venial* Sins only, or to *mortal* ones *unknown*; but paſſing over the ſecret *Reaſons*, or *Motives* for the Doctrine, He employs all his *Wit* and *Learning* to give the faireſt Colours to it [n].

[m] Remiſſionem Peccatorum *graviorum* & *mortalium*, quæ poſt Baptiſmum commiſſa ſunt, docent quærendam & impetrandam eſſe noſtra *Contritione*, *Confeſſione*, *Satisfactione*, *Sacrificio Miſſæ*, & aliis modis. Vident autem totam illam *veniarum* ſtructuram collapſuram, ſi *Remiſſio* illa & Reconciliatio quæratur in *Corpore* & *Sanguine* Chriſti. Ne tamen nihil tribuant *Euchariſtiæ*, loquuntur de *venialibus*, hoc eſt, ſicut *Jeſuitæ* interpretantur, de levioribus & minutioribus peccatis. Ut igitur *Satisfactiones* ſuas & reliquas *veniarum nundinationes* retineant, acerbè dimicant, in vero uſu Euchariſtiæ non fieri Applicationem *Remiſſionis* Peccatorum. *Chemnit. Exam. Concil. Trident.* Part 2. p. 70.

[n] *Bellarmin.* Tom. III. L. IV. de Euchariſt. c. 17, 18, 19.

Gerhard

CHAP. IX.

Gerhard came after, and defended *Chemnitius* in that Article, confuting *Bellarmine* [o]. I perceive not that the learned *Cardinal*, with all his acuteneſs, was able to prove any Thing with reſpect to the main Queſtion, more than this, (which has been allow'd above) that Baptiſm is *emphatically*, or *eminently* the Sacrament of *Remiſſion*, and the Euchariſt of *Spiritual Growth:* And while He is forced to acknowledge that *venial* Sins are remitted in the Euchariſt, and *unknown mortal* ones, as often as *neceſſary* [p], it is obvious to perceive, that it was not any *Love* of *Truth*, or *Strength* of *Argument* on that Side, which with-held Him from granting more. His ſtrongeſt Plea, which all the reſt do in a manner reſolve into, is no more than this; that as the *worthy* Communicant is ſuppoſed to bring with Him *true Faith*, and *ſincere Repentance* to the Lord's Table, He comes *pardoned* thither, and can have no *Pardon* to take out there upon his receiving the Euchariſt. I mention not, how the Argument recoils upon his own *Hypotheſis*. The true Anſwer is, that the Grace of *Remiſſion*, or *Juſtification*, is *progreſſive*, and may be always *improving*, as before noted [q]: And

[o] *Gerhard.* Loc. Comm. Tom. V. de Sacr. Cœn. c. XX. p. 175. &c. Compare *Vines.* Treatiſe of the Lord's Supper, p. 328. printed 1657.

[p] Poſſet etiam dici Euchariſtiam applicare Hæreditatem, etiam quantum ad *Remiſſionem Peccatorum*, ſed tum ſolum cum ea eſt *neceſſaria*; nimirum cum ii qui non indignè accedunt, habent aliqua peccata *mortalia*, quorum tamen conſcientiam non habent. *Bellarm.* ibid. c. XIX. p. 655.

[q] See Above p. 330. Bp. *Taylor*'s Doctrine on this Head, as it lies ſcattered in diſtant Pages, may be worth noting. " Juſtifi-

And whatever *Pardon* we may conceive our ſelves to be intituled to before, or to be then in Poſſeſſion of, yet it is no ſlight Advantage to have the ſame ſolemnly *renewed*, *eſtabliſhed*, *ratified* and *ſealed* in the Holy Communion, by a *formal* Application there made of the *Merits* of the grand *Atonement*, in which only, after our performing the *Conditions*, our *Remiſſion* ſtands.

CHAP. X.

Of the Sanctifying Grace of the Holy Spirit conferred in the EUCHARIST.

THE Greek Χάρις, the Latin *Gratia*, the Engliſh *Grace*, is a Word of ſome Latitude, admitting of various Acceptations: I need not mention all, but ſuch only as are moſt for our preſent Purpoſe. *Grace* in the general, ſignifies *Favour*, *Mercy*, *Indulgence*, *Bounty:* In particular, it ſignifies a *Gift*, and more eſpe-

" Juſtification and Sanctification are *continued Acts:* They are " like the Iſſues of a Fountain into its Receptacles, God is al- " ways giving, and we are always receiving. *Worth. Comm.* " p. 43. The Sacrament miniſters Pardon, as Pardon is mini- " ſtred in this World, *by Parts.*——In the uſual Methods " of God, Pardon is *proportionable* to our Repentance, p. 52. " If we find that we *increaſe* in *Duty*, then we may look up- " on the Tradition of the Sacramental Symbols, as a direct *Con-* " *ſignation* of *Pardon.* Not that it is *compleated:* For, it is a " *Work of Time*; it is *as long* a doing, as Repentance is *perfect-* " *ing*——It is *then working*; and if we go on in Duty, God " will proceed to *finiſh* his Methods of Grace, &c.——And " this He is pleaſed, by the Sacrament, all the way to *con-* " *ſign*, p. 74.

cially

CHAP. X. cially a *Spiritual Gift*, and in a Senſe yet more reſtrained, the *Gift* of *Sanctification*, or of ſuch *Spiritual Aids* as may enable a Man both to *will* and to *do* according to what God has commanded. The laſt which I have named appears to be the moſt prevailing Acceptation of the Word *Grace* at this Day, derived from ancient uſage, and common conſent, which gives the Law to Forms of Speech, and to the Interpretation thereof. The uſe of the Word in the New Teſtament is various, ſometimes larger, ſometimes ſtricter, often doubtful which. I will not be poſitive, as to ſeveral Texts where the Word *Grace* occurs, and ſeemingly in the ſtrict Senſe, that They muſt neceſſarily be taken according to ſuch *preciſe* Meaning, and can bear no *larger*, or no *other* Conſtruction: As where the *Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* is ſpoken of [r]; or where *Grace*, *Mercy*, and *Peace* are implored [s]; or *Grace* and *Peace* [t]; or where the *Grace* of *God* is mentioned [u]. In ſeveral Texts of that Sort, the Word *Grace* may be underſtood in the *ſtricter* Senſe, but may alſo admit of the *larger*; in which, however, the *Grace* of *Sanctification* muſt be *included* among others. The Texts which ſeem to be moſt expreſſive of the

[r] *Rom.* XVI. 20. 24. 1 *Cor.* XVI. 23. 2 *Cor.* XIII. 14. *Gal.* VI. 18. *Phil.* IV. 23. 1 *Theſſ.* V. 28. 2 *Theſſ.* III. 18. *Philem.* 25. *Revel.* XXII. 21.

[s] 1 *Tim.* I. 2. 2 *Tim.* I. 2. *Tit.* I. 4. 2 *John* 3.

[t] 1 *Pet.* I. 2. 2 *Pet.* I. 2. *Revel.* I. 4.

[u] *Acts* XIII. 43. XIV. 26. XV. 40. XX. 24. 1 *Cor.* I. 4. III. 10. XV. 10. 2 *Cor.* I. 12. VI. 1. *Epheſ.* III. 7. 1 *Pet.* IV. 10. *Tit.* II. 11.

limited Senſe, now in uſe, are ſuch as theſe: *Great Grace was upon them all*[w]. *The Grace of God beſtowed on the Churches of Macedonia*[x]. *My Grace is ſufficient for Thee*[y]. *Grow in Grace*[z]. *Let us have Grace, whereby we may ſerve God acceptably*[a]. *God giveth Grace unto the Humble*[b]. In theſe and the like Places, the Word *Grace*, moſt probably, ſignifies what we now commonly mean by that Name: Or if any *larger* Meaning be ſuppoſed, yet it is certainly *incluſive* of the other, ſignifying *That* and more. It is not very material whether we underſtand the Word *Grace*, in the New Teſtament, in the *comprehenſive* or *reſtrained* Senſe, ſince it would be diſputing only about *Words*, or *Names*. The *ſanctifying* Operations of the Holy Spirit of God upon the Minds of Men may be abundantly proved from the New Teſtament: And ſo it is of leſs moment to enquire what *Names* they go under, while we are *certain* of the *Things*. The Phraſe of *Grace*, or *ſanctifying Grace* is ſufficiently warranted by its ancient ſtanding in the Church[c], ſo that I need not dwell longer upon it, but may proceed directly to ſhew, that what we commonly call the *Grace* of *Sanctification*, is conferred in the Euchariſt.

CHAP. X.

[w] *Acts* IV. 33. Compare verſe 31.
[x] 2 *Cor.* VIII. 1. [y] 2 *Cor.* XII. 9.
[z] 2 *Pet.* III. 18. [a] *Hebr.* XII. 28.
[b] *Jam.* IV. 6. 1 *Pet.* V. 8.
[c] See ſome Account of the Eccleſiaſtical uſe of the Word *Grace*, in *Nelſon*'s Life of Bp. *Bull*, p. 519. &c. *Voſſius* Hiſtor. Pelag. L. III. par. 1. Theſ. 2. *Joh. Juſt. Von Einem.* Select. Animadv. ad *Joh. Clerici* Scripta. p. 761. &c. Magdeb. 1735.

CHAP. X.

1. I ARGUE, firſt, from the *Participation* of Chriſt's Death, with its *Fruits*, in the Euchariſt, according to the Doctrine of St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* X. 16. inſinuated alſo in the Words of the *Inſtitution*, as explained at large in a Chapter above. They who ſo *partake* of Chriſt, do of courſe partake of the *Spirit* of Chriſt: It cannot be otherwiſe upon *Chriſtian* Principles taught in the New Teſtament. If any Man is Chriſt's, He has the *Spirit of God dwelling in Him*[d]. And this Spirit is the Source and Fountain of *Righteouſneſs* and true *Holineſs*[e]. And no one can be made an *acceptable Offering* unto God, but He who is firſt *ſanctified* by the *Holy Spirit*[f].

2. THE ſame Thing will be proved, by undeniable *Conſequence*, from our Lord's Doctrine of the import of *Spiritual Feeding* laid down in *John* VI. For ſince it has been before ſhewn, that They who do *receive worthily*, do *ſpiritually* feed upon Chriſt, and are thereby made Partakers of all the *Privileges* thereto belonging, it plainly follows that they muſt have Chriſt *dwelling* in them[g]; and if *Chriſt*, they have the *Spirit* alſo of Chriſt, who is *inſeparable* from Him. Therefore, the *Sanctification* of the *Spirit* is conveyed in the Euchariſt, along with the other Spiritual Bleſſings, which ſuppoſe and imply it, and cannot be underſtood without it, upon Scripture-Principles.

[d] *Rom.* VIII. 9. 1 *Cor.* VI. 17.
[e] *Rom.* VIII. 10. 14. 1 *Cor.* VI. 11. 2 *Theſſ.* II. 13.
[f] *Rom.* XV. 16. [g] *John* VI. 56.

CHAP. X.

3. A FARTHER Argument may be drawn from the known *Analogy* there is between the *Two Sacraments*, taken together with thoſe ſeveral *Texts* which ſpeak directly of the Sanctification of the *Spirit* conferred in *Baptiſm*[h]; or an Argument may be drawn *a fortiori*, in this manner: If the *putting on* Chriſt (which is done in Baptiſm) carries with it a Conveyance of the *Holy Spirit*; much more does the *eating* or *drinking* Chriſt, which is done in the Euchariſt.

4. BUT to argue yet more *directly* (tho' *indirect* Arguments, where the *Connexion* is clear and certain, as in this Caſe, are not the leſs *concluſive)* we may next draw a Proof of the ſame Doctrine from the expreſs Words of St. *Paul*, where He ſays: *By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body* ——— *and have been all made to drink into one Spirit*[i]. That is to ſay, by one and the ſame *Spirit* before ſpoken of[k], we Chriſtians (as many of us as are ſo more than in *Name)* are in Baptiſm made one *myſtical* Body of Chriſt, and have been all made to *drink* of the Sacramental Cup in the Euchariſt; whereby the *ſame Spirit* hath again *united* us, yet more perfectly, to *Chriſt* our *Head*, in the ſame *myſtical* Body. Such appears to be the natural and obvious Senſe of the Place: Which accordingly has been ſo underſtood by judicious Interpreters, *an-*

[h] *John* III. 5. 1 *Cor.* VI. 11. *Epheſ.* V. 26. *Tit.* III. 5.
[i] 1 *Cor.* XII. 13. [k] 1 *Cor.* XII. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11.

CHAP. X.

cient [l] and *modern* [m]. I ſhall not diſſemble it, that ſeveral *ancient* Interpreters, as well as ſome moderns, have underſtood the whole Text of *Baptiſm* only; interpreting the former Part of the *outward* waſhing, and the latter Part of the *Spirit* accompanying it [n]. But, it ſeems, They did not well conſider, that the concurrence of the *Spirit* in Baptiſm, had been ſufficiently inſinuated before, in the former Part of the Verſe; *By one Spirit are we all baptized*, &c. And therefore to interpret *Spirit* again of the ſame Sacrament, appears to border too nearly upon *Tautology*: Neither did They ſufficiently reflect, how harſh a Figure that of *drinking* is, if applied to Baptiſm; when *putting on* the Spirit (as is elſewhere ſaid of Chriſt, with reſpect to that Sacrament [o]) might have been much more proper. They may ſeem alſo to have forgot, or not to have conſider'd, how ſuitable and pertinent it was to the Apoſtle's Argument, to refer to *both* Sacraments in that Place, as I ſhall now make appear.

IT might be highly proper, and much to the Purpoſe, when the Apoſtle was mentioning *Baptiſm*, as *one* Bond of myſtical Union, to take notice alſo of the *Euchariſt*, as *ano-*

[l] *Chryſoſtom.* in loc. Tom. V. p. 324. Ed. Pariſ. *Damaſcen.* in Loc.

[m] *Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, Gerhard, Grotius, Gataker, Hammond, Locke, Wells. Vitringa.* Obſerv. Sacr. L. V. c. 7. p. 109, 114.

[n] *Pelagius*, under the Name of *Jerome*; and *Hilary* the *Deacon*, under the Name of *Ambroſe*: As likewiſe *Theophylact* in loc. And perhaps more.

[o] *Gal.* III. 27.

ther;

ther; which it certainly was, according to his own Doctrine in the ſame Epiſtle[p]. Indeed, it might be thought a kind of *Omiſſion*, and in ſome meaſure *diminiſhing* the Force of his Argument, in this Place, had He referred but to *One* Sacrament, when there was juſt occaſion, or the like occaſion for referring to *Both*. His Deſign was to ſet forth the inviolable *Union* of Chriſtians, and to repreſent the ſeveral *Ties* by which they were bound together. He knew that the *Euchariſt* was a ſtrong *Cement* of that *myſtical Union*, as well as the other Sacrament; for He had himſelf declared as much, by ſaying elſewhere, *We being many are one Body, being all Partakers of that one Bread.* It was therefore very natural here again to take notice of the *Euchariſt*, when He was enumerating the Bonds of *Union*, and amongſt them particularly the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, which would obviouſly lead to the mentioning this other Sacrament. Accordingly, He has briefly, and elegantly made mention of this other, in the Words, *made to drink into one Spirit.* Where made to *drink*, but in the *Euchariſt?* He had formerly ſignified the myſtical Union under the Emblem of *one Loaf:* And now He chooſes to ſignify the ſame again under the Emblem of *one Cup*, (an Emblem, wherein *Ignatius*, within 50 Years after, ſeems to have follow'd Him[q]) both belonging to one and the ſame Euchariſt,

[p] 1 *Cor.* X. 16, 17.

[q] Ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. *Ignat.* ad Philadelph. c. IV.

CHAP. X.

both referring to one and the ſame myſtical Head. Dr. *Claget* well argues againſt the *Romaniſts*, from this Text, as follows: "St. *Paul* "thought, the Obſervation of the *two* Inſtitu- "tions of our Saviour (viz. *Baptiſm*, and the "*Communion* of the Holy Table) was a ſuffi- "cient Proof that Believers were *one Body*: "And we have reaſon to believe, that if He "had *known* there were *other* Sacraments —— "He would not have *omitted* the mention of "them here, where He proves the *Unity* of "the Church by *Baptiſm*, and *Communion* "of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. It is ſome- "thing to our Purpoſe, that St. *Paul* owns "no more than Theſe, where He induſtriouſ- "ly proves that Chriſtians are *one Body* by "Theſe[r]. If this Reaſoning be juſt, as it appears to be, and if St. *Paul* knew (as He certainly did know) that the *Euchariſt* has ſome ſhare in making Chriſtians *one Body*, as well as the other *Sacrament*, it manifeſtly follows, that He could not well *omit* the mention of it in this Place. I ſhould take notice, that our very judicious ABp. *Sharpe* has preſſed the ſame Argument, in a fuller and ſtill ſtronger manner, from the ſame Text[s]; and that the *Proteſtants* in general have made the like uſe of the Text in their diſputes with the *Romaniſts*, againſt *multiplying* Sacraments, or againſt *mutilating* the Sacrament of the Euchariſt by taking away the

[r] *Claget*, Vol. I. Serm. X. p. 263.

[s] *Sharpe*, Vol. VII. Serm. V, VI. p. 106, &c. Serm. X. p. 230.

Cup

Cup from it[t]. So that beſides *Commentators*, in great Numbers, thus interpreting this Text, there is the concurring Judgment of many or moſt *Proteſtant Divines* confirming the ſame Conſtruction. CHAP. X.

NEVERTHELESS *Socinus*, having formed a Project to throw off *Water-Baptiſm*, labour'd extremely to elude the Interpretation before mention'd. He conſidered, that if the *latter* Part of it were interpreted of the *external* Service of the *Euchariſt*, then the *former* Part muſt of courſe be underſtood of *external* Baptiſm: Beſides that He was not willing to allow that any inward *Grace* went along with either Sacrament. Such were his *Motives* for eluding the true meaning of this Text: His *Pretexts*, or *Colourings*, were as here follow:

1. HE pleaded, that partaking of the Euchariſt is never once repreſented in the New Teſtament by that *particular Part* of it, the *drinking*. He acknowledges that the *whole Service* is ſometimes ſignified by the *other Part* (the *nobler Part*, in his Judgment) *viz.* the *eating*, or *breaking Bread*; but that it ſhould be ſignified by *drinking only*, the meaner Part of the Sacrament, He could not be perſwaded to allow[v].

BUT

[t] Nihil obſtat quo minùs Synecdochicè hoc loco *Potionis* ac *poculi* nomine explicetur *Euchariſtia* (quod *Proteſtantes omnes* meritò ex hoc loco pertendunt, contra *Subſtractionem Calicis* in Communione Romana) ac alibi per ſolam panis Fractionem deſignatur. Act. XI. 42, 46. XX. 7. *Mareſius*, Hydra Socinianiſmi, Tom. III. p. 835.

[v] Cur quæſo *Paulus* Cœnam Dominicam cum Baptiſmo collaturus

CHAP. X.

BUT He ſeems to me to have been over delicate in this matter, and more ſcrupulous than need required. For, ſince the *whole* Service (as He is forced to confeſs) may be ſignified by *one Part*, while the *other* is underſtood; why not by the *drinking*, as well as by the *eating*? Or why muſt the *eating* be looked upon as the *nobler*, and *better* Part of the Two, in this Inſtance eſpecially, when the *Blood* of Chriſt, (the moſt *precious* Blood of Chriſt, ſo much ſpoken of in the New Teſtament) is the Thing *ſignified*[w]? But ſuppoſing the *eating*, or the *Meat* to be the nobler of the two, then the New Teſtament, one would think, has paid a proper Reſpect to it, by denominating the *whole* from it *more than once*; tho' taking the Liberty to pay *ſome* Regard alſo to the *other Part*, by denominating the *whole* from it *once* at leaſt, if no more. The Apoſtle might have particular Reaſons for doing it here, becauſe having mention'd *waſhing* juſt before, as belonging to one Sacrament, He might think that *drinking* would beſt anſwer to it in the other Sacra-

laturus *Potionis* tantum mentionem feciſſet, non etiam *comeſtionis*, ſive *cibi*, quæ *præcipua* ex duabus quodammodo Cœnæ illius partibus cenſenda eſt, & cujus *ſolius* nomine alicubi *Tota Cœna* intelligitur, ut 1 *Cor.* XI. 33. ——— Frequentiſſimè in Sacris Literis *Solius Cibi*, aut etiam *Panis* mentione facta, ipſe quoque *Potus* intelligitur: Id quod, ſaltem in Cœna Domini, nunquam *Potionis ſolius* nomine fieri contingit. *Socin.* de Bapt. Aquæ, c. VIII. conf. *Volkel.* de ver. Relig. L. VI. c. 14. p. 684. alias 835.

[w] It may be noted, that the *Ancients*, when they made any diſtinction, ſuppoſed the *Cup*, the *drinking*, to be the *nobler* Part of the Two, as being the *finiſhing* and *perfecting* Part. See *Salmaſius* de Tranſubſtantiatione contr. Grot. p. 280, — 284.

ment,

ment, as *Water* and *Wine* are more analogous than *Water* and *Bread*[x]. Or ſince the Apoſtle had ſignified *Chriſtian Unity* before[y], under the Emblem of Sacramental *Meat*, He might chooſe the rather now to repreſent the *ſame Unity* under the Emblem of Sacramental *Drink*, being that there is as properly *one Cup*, as there is *one Loaf*. CHAP. X.

2. *Socinus* and *Volkelius* farther plead, that had the Apoſtle intended to ſpeak of the *Lord's Supper*, He would have uſed the Word ποτιζόμεθα, to denote the Time *preſent*, not ἐποτίσθημεν, which refers to Time *paſt*: For, the Lord's Supper is what Chriſtians *continually* partake of with *repeated* Attendance, and ſo is never wholly *paſt*, or *done with*, like Baptiſm which is but *once* ſubmitted to[z].

Now, in anſwer to this reaſoning, I ſhall not inſiſt, as I juſtly might, upon the known Latitude of the *Aoriſts*, which are *indefinite* as to Time; nor upon any *enallage* of *Tenſes*, which

[x] Conf. *Hoornbeeck*, Socin. Confut. Tom. III. p. 381.

[y] 1 *Cor.* X. 17.

[z] Si *Paulus* Cœnam Dominicam intellexiſſet, non verbo *præteriti* Temporis, *potavimus*, ſed *potamus* præſentis uſus fuiſſet: cum ea Cœna non a quolibet Chriſtiano Homine plane & omnino jam *manducata fuerit* aliquando, ſed identidem in poſterum, ubi facultas detur, manducari debeat. *Socinus* de Bapt. Aquæ, c. VIII. p. 88, 89.

Adde quod non *potavimus*, ſed *potamus* dixiſſet, ſi de Cœna Dominica locutus fuiſſet. ——— Actiones quippe quas ſemel perfeciſſe ſatis eſt, *præteriti* potius quam *præſentis* Temporis verbo exprimi ſolent: Hæc vero, cum & in poſterum, qualibet ſe offerente occaſione peragenda ſit, rectiùs & communi conſuetudini loquendi convenientius *præſentis* Temporis verbo effertur. *Volkelius*, Lib. VI. c. 14. p. 685, alias 836.

CHAP. X.

is frequent in Scripture; but allowing that St. *Paul* is to be underſtood of the *Time paſt*, in that Inſtance, I ſay, it is no juſt Objection againſt interpreting the Text of the *Euchariſt*. The Apoſtle is there ſpeaking of the Union of Chriſtians as then *actually ſubſiſting*, and therefore *made* before He ſpake of it; made by *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper*, conſidered as *previous* to that Union, and therefore *paſt*. He had nothing to do with *future* Communions, ſo far as his Argument was concerned: None but *paſt* Communions could have any Share in making, or ſtrengthening that *Union*, which *ſubſiſted* before He ſpake of it. Therefore it might be proper in both the Inſtances, to make uſe of a *Verb* of the *preter Tenſe*, referring to Time *paſt*. *Communions*, which *are not*, or only *will be*, or *may be*, unite nothing, effect nothing in the *mean Seaſon*, but would have been *foreign* to the Apoſtle's Argument, which looked only to what had *been done*, and had had its *Effect* already upon the *Union* then ſubſiſting. The Euchariſt in that View, was a Thing *paſt*, as much as *Baptiſm*; and ſo the *Verbs* in both Inſtances were rightly choſen, and aptly anſwer to each other[a]: *We have been all baptized*, and *we have been all made to drink*[b], &c.

[a] Conf. *Hoornbeeck*, Tom. III. p. 387. *Mareſius* Hydra, Tom. III. p. 836.

[b] Πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν——πάντες εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν. As to ſome few Copies here reading πόμα for πνεῦμα, I refer to Dr. *Mill*, who vindicates the preſent Reading. But the Senſe might be the ſame either way, becauſe the preceding Words, *By one Spirit*, might be applied to both Parts of the Sentence.

3. *Socinus* and *Volkelius* farther urge, (which looks the moſt like an Argument of any Thing they have) that the Apoſtle, in that Chapter, refers only to the *extraordinary* Gifts of the Spirit, and therefore cannot reaſonably be underſtood either of *Baptiſm*, or the *Euchariſt*, which were *common* to all Chriſtians, and not to the *gifted* only [c]. But it is unfortunate for this Objection, that the Apoſtle ſhould ſo emphatically word it twice over, *We have all*, &c. as it were on purpoſe to prevent its being underſtood to relate to the *gifted* only. The *univerſality* of the Apoſtle's Expreſſion is a much ſtronger Argument for interpreting Him of the *Sacraments*, than any Thing elſe in the Context can be for underſtanding the Words of the *extraordinary* Gifts: For, it is plain, and is on all Hands confeſſed, that the extraordinary Gifts were not *common* to *all*, or to *many*, but rather peculiar to a *few* only in compariſon. But to anſwer more directly to the Pretence drawn from the *Context*, it may be obſerved, that the *Deſign* of the Apoſtle in that Chapter does not only well ſuit with the Interpretation we contend for, but is *better* cleared upon that Foot, than upon any other. His *Deſign* was to prevent, as much as poſſible, any *Emulation* between the *gifted* and *ungifted* Brethren. How does He execute it? By repreſenting, how

[c] De donis *Spiritualibus*; ut unicuique totum caput accurate legenti conſtare poterit. *Socinus*, c. VIII. p. 84. *Paulus* iſto in loco de *variis* Spiritus Sancti *donis* differit, quibus Deus per Filium ſuum *primam* illam *Eccleſiam* mirum in modum locupletaverat. *Volkelius*, L. VI. c. 14. p. 675, alias 815.

CHAP. X.

many Things were *common* to all, and how far *all of them* participated of the *Spirit*, one way or other. 1. They *all* owned Chriſt *Jeſus* for their *Lord*, which none could do *but by the Holy Ghoſt*[d]; therefore they were ſo far upon a level, with reſpect to the Favour of the *Holy Spirit*. 2. Thoſe extraordinary Gifts, imparted to a *few*, were really intended for the *common* Benefit of the *whole Body*: They were *given to every one* of the gifted, *to profit* others *withal*[e]. 3. The ſame Spirit was preſent to the *whole Church*, to all *true* Members of it, in both *Sacraments*[f]; ſo that they did not only reap the *Benefits* of what the *gifted* Men did, but they had themſelves an immediate *Communion* with the ſelf-ſame Spirit, in as *uſeful*, tho' not altogether ſo *glaring* a way. 4. However pompous thoſe *ſhining* Gifts might appear, and be apt to dazzle, yet there were *other* Gifts more *excellent*[g] by far than they, and *common* to all good Chriſtians; namely, the Gifts of *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*[h], from the ſame Spirit[i]. Such appears to be the Scope and Connexion of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe in that Chapter and the Chapter following: And it is ſo far from proving that the *Text* which we are now conſidering, belongs not to the *Sacraments*,

[d] 1 *Cor.* XII. 3. [e] 1 *Cor.* XII. 7.
[f] 1 *Cor.* XII. 13. [g] 1 *Cor.* XII. 31.
[h] 1 *Cor.* XIII. 1,——13.
[i] That appears to be inſinuated by the Apoſtle there: But elſewhere He expreſsly teaches, that all ſuch Chriſtian Virtues are the *Fruits of the Spirit*, Gal. V. 22. Epheſ. V. 9.

that,

that, on the contrary, it very much *confirms* That Conſtruction [k]. CHAP. X.

ENOUGH, I preſume, hath been ſaid for the vindicating our Conſtruction of this Text againſt the forced Gloſſes and unnatural Evaſions of *Socinus* and his *Followers:* Tho' ſome of them, either more acute, or more ingenuous than the reſt, have not ſcrupled to give up the *new* Conſtruction, ſo far, as to underſtand the Text of both *Sacraments* [m].

THE *Conſtruction* of the Text being thus far fix'd and ſettled, it remains now, that we draw the juſt *Concluſion* from it, and ſo wind up our Argument. If the *drinking* of the Sacramental Cup is drinking into *one Spirit*, the Spirit of God, then the Euchariſt duly adminiſtred and duly received, is a *Medium* by which we ordinarily partake of the *ſame Spirit*, and conſequently of the *ſanctifying* Gifts or Graces of the Spirit. By this we underſtand, how He that *is joined unto* Chriſt our *Lord*, is *one Spirit* [n] with Him: Becauſe that *Spirit* who is *eſſentially* one with Him, is *Sacramentally* united with us. And as Chriſt *dwelleth* in all thoſe who *Spiritually* feed upon Him [o], ſo are all ſuch the *Tem-*

[k] Compare *Clem. Alexandrin.* Pædag. L. I. c. XI. p. 106, 107.

[m] Nec auſim multum ab iis diſſentire, qui in iſtis verbis non ad *Baptiſmum* tantum, ſed ad *Cœnam Domini* quoque reſpici putant: Utrumque enim Inſtitutum nos tam ad *unitatem* & *communionem* unius Corporis Eccleſiæ accedere, quam in unitate Corporis ejuſdem manere teſtatur. *Sam. Przipcovius* in loc. p. 93.

[n] 1 *Cor.* VI. 17.

[o] *John* VI. 56.

ple

CHAP. X.

ple of the *Holy Ghoſt* [p]; and while they are ſo, they are *ſanctified* both in Body and Soul. Such *Sanctification* carries in it all that the Scripture reckons up among the *Fruits* of the Spirit, as *inriching* the *Soul* [q]; and likewiſe all that concerns the *immortalizing* of the *Body* [r], and *ſealing* the whole Man to future Glory [s]. All theſe Bleſſings and Privileges are conferred in the Euchariſt, to them who receive *worthily*; becauſe the *Spirit* is conferred in it, who is the Fountain of them all, and whoſe *gracious* Preſence ſuppoſes them.

IN Confirmation of what hath been advanced upon Scripture-Principles, it may now be proper to deſcend to *Fathers*, who had the ſame *Scriptures* before them, and whoſe Sentiments, if concurring, may be of uſe to give us the more abundant Satisfaction in the preſent Article. I have occaſionally, in the courſe of theſe Papers, cited ſeveral Paſſages which ſpeak expreſsly or implicitely of *Sanctification*, as conferr'd *in* or by the Euchariſt. I ſhall not here repeat the ſame at full length, but ſhall throw them together in a ſummary way, to ſerve as Hints for recollection. What has been cited above * from *Ignatius*, *Juſtin*, and *Irenæus*, of the *Beneficial* nature of the Sacrament, neceſſarily infers or implies the *Graces* of the Holy Spirit. *Clemens*

[p] 1 *Cor.* III. 16. VI. 19. 2 *Cor.* VI. 16. *Epheſ.* II. 21, 22. 1 *Pet.* II. 5.

[q] *Gal.* V. 22. *Epheſ.* V. 9.

[r] *Rom.* VIII. 10, 11.

[s] *Epheſ.* I. 13, 14. IV. 30. 2 *Cor.* I. 22.

* See above, p. 155, 214—225.

CHAP. X.

Clemens of *Alexandria*, upon another occaſion, has been cited, expreſsly ſaying that They who receive the Euchariſt with *Faith*, are *ſanctified both in Body and Soul* [t]. *Tertullian* ſays, that the *Body* is fed with the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that the *Soul may be repleniſhed with God* [u]. In like manner, *Origen* aſſerts, that the Euchariſt does *ſanctify* them that *uſe it as they ought* [w]. The ſame Thing is intimated by *Cyprian* of that Time, under ſome variety of expreſſion [x]. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* expreſsly ſays, that the Heavenly Bread and ſalutary Cup *ſanctify both Body and Soul* [y]. *Gaudentius Brixienſis*, whom I have not quoted before, ſays of the Euchariſtical Food, that it *ſanctifies even Them who conſecrate it* [z]. Laſtly, *Cyril* of *Alexandria* maintains, that faithful Communicants are *ſanctified by being Partakers of the Holy Fleſh, and precious Blood of Chriſt, the Saviour of us all* [a]. Theſe Teſtimonies might ſuffice to ſhew how unanimous the Ancients were, in aſſerting *Sanctification*, as conferred in the *Euchariſt*.

[t] *Clem. Alex.* Pædag. L. 2. c. 2. p. 178. See above c. VII. p. 226.

[u] *Tertullian.* de Reſurr. Carn. c. VIII. p. 330. See Above c. VII. p. 231.

[w] *Origen.* in Matt. p. 254. contr. Celſ. L. VIII. p. 766. See above c. V. p. 130, 131.

[x] *Cyprian.* Ep. 54. 63. See above c. VII. p. 237.

[y] *Cyrill. Hieroſ.* Myſtag. IV. p. 321. See above c. VII. p. 240. Conf. *Hilar. Diac.* Supr. *p.* 32.

[z] Conſecrantes Sanctificat conſecratus. *Gaudent.* Brix. de Exod. 2. p. 806.

[a] Ἁγιαζόμεθα μέτοχοι γενόμενοι τ τε ἁγίας σαρκὸς, καὶ τ τιμί͂ου αἵματος τ πάντων ἡμῶν σωτῆρος Χριστ͂ου. *Cyrilli & Synod. Alexandr.* Epiſt. apud *Binium.* Vol. 2. p. 210. Conf. *Theophil. Alexandrin.* Paſch. 1. inter opp. Hieron. Tom. IV. p. 698.

BUT

CHAP. X.

BUT for the farther *Confirmation*, or *Illuſtration* of this Particular, I ſhall now proceed to conſider what the *Ancients* taught concerning the *Deſcent*, or *Illapſe* of the *Holy Spirit* upon the *Symbols*, or upon the *Communicants* in this Holy Solemnity. Which I the rather chuſe to do, that I may at the ſame Time clear up that important Article, in ſome meaſure, and remove ſome common Miſtakes.

TO give the Reader a juſt Idea of the whole Thing, it will be neceſſary to begin with the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, wherein the like *Deſcent* or *Illapſe* of the Holy Ghoſt was expected, and where the like *Invocation* obtained very early; ſooner, I conceive, than in the Service of the *Euchariſt*, ſo far as may be judged from the Records now remaining. The *Form* of *Baptiſm*, probably, might give the firſt Handle for it, as it ran in the Name of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*. Or, there appeared ſufficient warrant in the new Teſtament, for beſeeching God to *ſend* the *Holy Spirit*, ſince our Lord had promiſed that his Heavenly Father would *give the Holy Spirit to them that* would *ask Him*[b]. Where could they more properly ask it, than in their *Sacramental* Offices, in that of *Baptiſm* eſpecially, when the New Teſtament makes ſuch frequent mention of the *Holy Spirit*, as aſſiſting to it, or preſiding in it[c]? Indeed, we find no *expreſs* mention in the New Teſtament of any ordinary *Deſcent* or *Illapſe* of the Spirit in

[b] *Luke* XI. 13.

[c] See above, in this Chapter, p. 367.

either

either *Sacrament*, nor any *direct* Precept for a special *Invocation* of that kind: Neither can we be *certain* of *Apoſtolical* Practice, as to that particular. The cuſtom might commence in the *Apoſtolical* Age, or it might come in later: But whenever it commenced, it ſeems to have been grounded upon ſuch *Scripture-Principles* as I have juſt now hinted. CHAP. X.

Tertullian (about A. D. 200.) is, I think, the firſt who ſpeaks any Thing *plainly* and *fully* to this Matter[d]. He ſuppoſes that ever ſince *the Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters*[e], all Waters have been privileged for receiving the Spirit, and becoming *Signs* and *inſtruments* of Sanctification, upon *Prayer* made to *God*: Particularly, in *Baptiſm*, after *Prayer* has been ſent up, the *Holy Ghoſt* comes down upon the *Waters*, and *ſanctifies* them, yea and gives them a *ſanctifying* Quality. But He ſuppoſes the *Angel of Baptiſm* to be ſent beforehand[f], to *prepare* the *way* for the reception of the Spirit; which He endeavours to illuſtrate from ſome reſembling Caſes in the New Teſtament[g]. After the *Angel*'s performing his Part[h] upon the *Waters*,

[d] Omnes Aquæ de priſtina originis prærogativa Sacramentum Sanctificationis conſequuntur, *invocato Deo*: Supervenit enim ſtatim *Spiritus* de Cœlis, & *Aquis ſupereſt*, ſanctificans eas de *ſemetipſo*; & ita Sanctificatæ vim Sanctificandi combibunt. *Tertullian.* de Baptiſm, c. IV. p. 225.

[e] *Gen.* I. 2.

[f] *Tertull.* ibid. c. VI. Angelus Baptiſmi Arbiter ſuperventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione delictorum, quam Fides impetrat, obſignata in Patre, & Filio, & Spiritu Sancto, p. 226.

[g] *John* V. 4. *Matt.* III. 3.

[h] It is frequent with the *Ancients*, to ſpeak of the Offices of *Angels*,

CHAP. X.

Waters, the *Holy Spirit* deſcended in Perſon on the Parties coming to be baptized, and reſted, as it were, upon the *Waters*[i]. So writes our Author: And the true meaning, or reſult of all is, that the *Holy Spirit*, by his coming, *ſanctifies* the *Perſons* in the *uſe* of thoſe Waters, or uſe of that Service[k]. Allowances muſt be made for ſomething of oratorical Flight and Figure, contriv'd for Ornament, and to make the more lively Impreſſion: It would be wrong to conceive, that every *Pool*, *Pond*, or *River*, in which any Perſon happen'd to be baptized, contracted any *abiding* Holineſs from that Time forwards, or that it was not left open to all *common* uſes as before. It is evident, that *Tertullian*, where He came to explain his Notion, and, as it were, to correct his looſer and leſs accurate Expreſſions, did not ſuppoſe the *Waters* to be ſo much as the *Medium*, properly ſpeaking, of *Sanctifi-*

Angels, which they ſuppoſed to be employ'd in *miniſtring* to God, for the *Heirs of Salvation*, according to *Heb.* I. 14. And according to their reſpective *Offices*, they aſſigned them *Names*, having no other Rule to go by. So they ſometimes mention, beſides the *Angel of Baptiſm*, (which means *any*, or *every* Angel ſo employ'd) The *Angel* alſo of *Prayer*, *Angel* of *Repentance*, *Angel* of *Peace*, and *Angel* of *Light*, or the like: Such manner of Speaking and Thinking was juſt and innocent, till the ſucceeding *Abuſes* by *Angel-Worſhip*, made it almoſt neceſſary for wiſe Men to lay it aſide.

[i] Tunc ille ſanctiſſimus Spiritus ſuper emundata & benedicta corpora libens a Patre deſcendit, ſuper Baptiſmi Aquas, tanquam priſtinam ſedem recognoſcens conquieſcit, columbæ figurâ dilapſus in Dominum, ut natura, &c. *Tertull.* ibid. c. VIII. p. 227.

[k] Eadem diſpoſitione *Spiritalis effectus*, Terræ, id eſt, *Carni* noſtræ, emergenti de Lavacro poſt vetera delicta, Columba ſancti Spiritûs advolat, *pacem Dei* adferens, emiſſa de Cœlis, ubi Eccleſia eſt *Arca* figurata. *Tertull.* ibid. c. VIII. p. 227.

cation;

cation; but He conceiv'd the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit* upon the *Perſons*, to come afterwards, when the *waſhing* was over, and done with[l]. I ſhall only note farther, with reſpect to theſe Paſſages of *Tertullian*, that it cannot be *certainly* concluded from them, that a *formal* Prayer for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Spirit*, was in uſe at that Time: But from his ſaying that immediately after *Invocation* of *God*, ſuch Deſcent follow'd, and from his adding afterwards, that in or by the *Benediction*, the Spirit was *called*, and *invited*[m], I look upon it as extremely *probable*[n], that the Practice did then obtain, in the *African* Churches, formally to pray for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, either *before* the Immerſion, or *after* (upon the *Impoſition* of Hands) or perhaps both before, and after. CHAP. X.

OUR next Author is *Origen* (about A.D. 240.) not that He directly ſays any Thing of the *Deſcent* of the *Spirit* in Baptiſm, or of any *Prayer* made uſe of for that Purpoſe: But He occaſionally drops ſome Things, which may give light to the preſent Queſtion. His Notion was,

[l] Reſtituitur Homo Deo, ad ſimilitudinem ejus qui retro ad Imaginem Dei fuerat. —— Recipit enim *illum* Dei *Spiritum*, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat, ſed poſt amiſerat per delictum. Non quod *in Aquis* Spiritum Sanctum conſequamur, ſed in Aquâ emundati ſub Angelo, Spiritui Sancto præparamur, *Ibid.* c. V, VI. p. 226.

[m] Dehinc manus imponitur, per Benedictionem *advocans* & *invitans* Spiritum Sanctum, c. VIII. p. 226, 227.

[n] It might be, that upon a Benediction formed in *general* Terms, Chriſtians might expect the Illapſe of the Spirit: But it appears more natural to think, from what *Tertullian* here ſays, that they directly and formally prayed for it.

that

CHAP. X. that the *Holy Spirit*, whoſe Office it is to *ſanctify*, operates not at all upon *inanimate* Things, nor upon *Perſons* of obdurate Wickedneſs, but upon Thoſe only who are capable of receiving his *ſanctifying* Influences[o]. Now, from his ſaying, that the Holy Spirit operates not on Things *inanimate*, it muſt follow, that He thought not at that time of any *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* upon the *Waters* of Baptiſm, but upon the *Perſons* only, thoſe that were *worthy*. *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, in the decline of the fourth Century, charg'd his Doctrine with that Conſequence, and thereupon condemn'd it, as overturning the *Conſecration* of the Waters of Baptiſm, ſuppoſed to be made by the *coming* of the Holy Ghoſt upon them[p]. But it is certain, that *Origen* did admit of a *Conſecration* of the *Water*[q], tho' He might not perhaps explain it in the manner which *Theophilus* moſt approved of 150 Years after: And it is his conſtant Doctrine, that the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit* goes along with the outward *waſhing*, wherever there is no Obſtacle on the part of the Recipient[r]. Nay, He

[o] Vid. *Origen.* περὶ ἀρχ'. p. 62. Edit. Bened. Conf. *Huetii* Origeniana, p. 46. *Albertin.* L. 2. p. 357.

[p] Dicit (*Origenes*) Spiritum Sanctum non operari in ea quæ *inanima* ſunt, nec ad *irrationabilia* pervenire: Quod adſerens, non recogitat aquas in Baptiſmate myſticas *Adventu* Sancti Spiritus conſecrari. *Theoph. Alex.* Lib. Paſchal. 1. p. 698. apud Hieronym. Opp. Tom. IV. Edit. Bened.

[q] Vid. *Origen.* in Johann. p. 124. Edit. Huet. And compare what He ſays of the *Euchariſtical* Conſecration (in *Matt.* p. 254.) where the Reaſon is the ſame. See alſo *Albertinus*, p. 358.

[r] Vid. *Origen.* in Matt. p. 391, 416. in Johann. p. 124, 125.

ſcrupled

ſcrupled not to admit, that *the Spirit of God* now *moves upon the Face of the Waters* [s] of Baptiſm, alluding to *Gen.* I. 2. ſo that *Origen* could not be much out of the way, upon this Article: But this we may collect from Him, that properly ſpeaking, the work of the *Spirit* in Baptiſm, was upon the *Perſons*, when fitly qualified, rather than upon the *outward* Element; and that the *Spirit*'s coming upon the *Water*, and other the like Phraſes, ought not to be too rigorouſly interpreted, but ſhould be underſtood with due Grains of Allowance.

A LATE learned Writer, apologizing for *Origen*, takes Notice, that *Chryſoſtom* was very *poſitive* for the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit* on the *outward* Symbols; a plain Sign that He did not think *Origen* to be guilty of the *Error* charg'd upon Him [t]. I rather think, that *Chryſoſtom* underſtood the *popular* way of expreſſing the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit*, in the ſame *qualified* Senſe that *Origen* before did; and That was one Reaſon why He would not come into the warm meaſures of *Theophilus*, *Epiphanius*, and other *Euſtathians* [v] of that Time, about the Year 400. And whereas it is ſuggeſted by the ſame *learn-*

[s] Καὶ παλιγγενεσίας ὀνομαζόμενον λυτρὸν μετὰ ἀναλαμπώσεως γινόμενον πνεύματος, τῷ νῦν ἐπιφερομένῳ, ἐπειδὴ περὶ θεός ἐστιν, ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ' ἐ πᾶσι μετὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐγγινομένῳ. Ibid. p. 125.

Note, that the *Latin* Verſion has obſcured the Senſe of the Paſſage, not obſerving, perhaps, the *Alluſion* to Geneſis.

[t] *Johnſon*, Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 181. alias 186.

[v] A *ſhort* Account of the *Odium* raiſed againſt *Origen*, may be ſeen in my *Second Defence*, p. 353, &c. and a *larger* in *Huetius Origeniana*.

CHAP. X.

ed Writer[w], that a *ſolemn Conſecration* of Things inanimate to *Holy Uſes*, without ſuppoſing a formal *Illapſe* of the *Spirit* upon them, is a *degrading* Account of a venerable Myſtery, and leaves no difference between the Conſecration of a *Church*, and the Conſecration of *Baptiſmal Water*, &c. I muſt take leave to reply, that the Concluſion is not juſt: For in Things ſo conſecrated to *Holy Uſes*, there will always be as much *difference* as there is between *more* and *leſs* ſacred, according as the *Ends* and *Uſes* are *higher* or *lower*, *holier* or *leſs* holy. The *higher* and *holier* the uſe is to which any Thing is conſecrated by proper Miniſters, ſo much the more *worthy* it is, and ſo much the *nearer* and more *important* Relation it bears to God and Religion; demanding thereupon ſo much the *greater* Reverence and more *awful* Regard.

St. *Cyprian* (A. D. 255.) ſpeaks of a Sacerdotal *Cleanſing* and *Sanctification* of the Baptiſmal Water; which He ſuppoſes to be wrought by the *Holy Spirit*[x], and very frequently makes mention of it, up and down in his Works. But He ſays nothing from whence one may certainly collect whether any formal *Prayer* for the *Deſcent* was then in uſe; neither does He explain in what Senſe the Holy Ghoſt was underſtood to *ſanctify* the Baptiſmal *Waters*. On-

[w] *Johnſon*, ibid. p. 182. alias 185.

[x] Oportet ergo *mundari* & *ſanctificari* Aquam prius a Sacerdote, ut poſſit Baptiſmo ſuo Peccata hominis qui baptizatur abluere. ——— Quomodo autem *mundare* & *ſanctificare* Aquam poteſt, qui ipſe immundus eſt, & apud quem *Spiritus Sanctus* non eſt? *Cyprian.* Epiſt. LXX. p. 190.

ly, as He intimates over and over, that the *End* and *Uſe* of ſanctifying the Water, was to convey *Spiritual Graces* to the *Perſons* coming to be baptized in it; and as it is certain that thoſe *Spiritual Graces* could not reſide in, or upon the outward Element, it is more than probable that He ſuppoſed the *Spirit* to reſt where thoſe *Spiritual* Effects reſted, that is, upon the *Perſons* only: And then the *ſanctifying* of the *Waters* can mean no more than the *conſecrating* them to the uſes of *perſonal* Sanctification. The *Spirit* made uſe of them as a *Symbol*, for conveying his *Graces*; and in that *uſe* conſiſted their *relative Holineſs*: But the Spirit dwells not properly upon *Them*, but upon the *Perſons* baptized.

WHEN we come down to the *fourth* Century, there we find plainer Evidences of formal Prayers offer'd for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* upon the *Waters* of Baptiſm. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* (who wrote A. D. 348.) ſpeaks to his Catechumens thus[y]: "The Holy Ghoſt is "coming to *ſeal* your Souls: —— Look not "upon the Laver as *common* Water, but to "the *Spiritual Grace* beſtow'd along with it. "—— This common Water, upon receiving "the Invocation of the *Holy Spirit*, and of "*Chriſt*, and of the *Father*, acquires a Virtue "of Sanctification". It may be doubted whe-

[y] Μέλλει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σφραγίζειν ὑμῶν τὰς ψυχὰς —— μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσεχε τῷ λυτρῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τὸ ὕδατος δι᾽ δομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι —— τὸ λιτὸν ὕδωρ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πατρὸς τὴν ὄπκλησιν λαβὸν, δύναμιν ἁγιότητος ἐπικτᾶται. *Cyril. Hieroſol.* Catech. III. Sect. 3. p. 40, 41.

CHAP. X.

ther *Cyril* here refers to the *Prayer* of *Conſecration*, or to the *Form* of *Baptiſm*: But it appears moſt probable, that He refers to the *Conſecration*; as the *Benedictine* Editor has endeavour'd to prove at large, in his *Notes* upon the Place. What I have further to obſerve upon it, is, that *Cyril* ſpeaks of the *Water* as receiving a *ſanctifying Virtue*. And what does He mean by it? He means what He had juſt before ſaid, that the *outward* waſhing and the *inward* Graces go together, and are both conferr'd at once upon the *worthy* Receiver, in the ſelf ſame Act. The *viſible* Sign is *connected*, in certain effect, with the *inviſible* Grace; and Both are applied, at the ſame inſtant, to the ſame Man, jointly concurring to the ſame End and Uſe[z]. This is the Foundation of the common way of ſpeaking, as if the Spirit and the Water were *phyſically* united with each other; which is not ſtrictly true in *Notion*, but amounts to the ſame in *moral* Effect.

Optatus, an *African* Biſhop (A. D. 368.) alluding to the Name ἰχθὺς, (a technical Name of our Lord) ſays; *This Fiſh* (meaning Chriſt) *is brought down upon the Waters of the Font, in Baptiſm, by Invocation*[a]. I preſume this refers to the *Conſecration-Prayer*[b]: And ſo it imports an Expectance of, or Petition for the *divine*

[z] Vid. *Voſſius* Harmon. Evangel. L. III. c. 4. p. 233. opp. Tom. VI.

[a] Hic eſt Piſcis qui in Baptiſmate, per Invocationem, Fontalibus undis inſeritur, &c. *Optat.* Lib. III. p. 61.

[b] See *Bingham*, Chriſtian Antiq. B. XI. c. X. Sect. 1. p. 333. Conſ. 340.

Preſence

Preſence of Chriſt, to ſanctify the Perſon bap- CHAP. tized in the *Uſe* of the appointed Service. X.

St. *Baſil* of the ſame Age (A. D. 374.) ſpeaks of the conjunction of *Water* and the *Spirit* in Baptiſm; firſt obſerving (in order to obviate Miſtakes, or invidious Conſtructions) that the Church did not mean to prefer *Water* before all other *Creatures*; much leſs to give it a ſhare in the Honours due to the *Father* and the *Son*[c]: But He takes notice, that the *Water* ſerves to make out the *Symbol* of a *Death unto Sin*, and the *Spirit* is the *Pledge*, or *Earneſt* of Life[d]: Therefore *Water* and the *Spirit* go together in that Sacrament. Then He adds, that as to the *Grace* ſuppoſed to be in the *Water*, it belongs not properly to the *Water*, but is entirely owing to the *Preſence* of the *Spirit*[e]. Preſence *how*, and *where*? To the *Water*, or to the *Perſons*? His next immediate Words will decide the Queſtion; for He adds, in the Language of St. *Peter*, that *Baptiſm is not the putting away the Filth of the Fleſh, but the ſtipulation of a good Conſcience towards God*[f]. The *Spirit* therefore, in his Account, muſt reſt upon the *Perſons*, to anſwer the *End*. He proceeds, ſoon after, to obſerve how much the Baptiſm of the *Spirit*

[c] Καὶ εἰς ὕδωρ βαπτιζόμεθα, καὶ οὐδήπου τὸ ὕδωρ πάσης ὑμῖν τῆς κτίσεως προτιμήσομεν, ἢ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τιμῆς μεταδώσομεν. Baſil. de Sp. S. c. XV. p. 28. Tom. III. Edit. Bened.

[d] Baſil. ibid. p. 29.

[e] Ὥστε εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι χάρις, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ὄντι τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς πνεύματος παρουσίας. ὁ γὰρ ὄντι τὸ Βάπτισμα ῥύπου σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν. *Baſil.* ibid. p. 29.

[f] 1 *Pet.* III. 21.

CHAP. X. is preferable to baptizing merely with *Water*; and He takes notice, that there is a *Baptiſm*, as valuable as any, wherein no *Water* at all is needful, namely, *Baptiſm* in one's own *Blood*, as a *Martyr* for the Name of Chriſt. Then He cloſes up the Article He was upon, in theſe Words: "Not that I ſay this, in order to diſ-"parage *Water-Baptiſm*, but to baffle the Rea-"ſonings of thoſe who riſe up againſt the *Spi-"rit*, and who would *blend* Things together "which are *not blended*, and *compare* Things "together, which admit not of *Compariſons*.

I HAVE laid theſe Things together, as *explanatory* of what the ancient Fathers meant by *joining* the *Spirit* with the outward *Elements* in the *Sacraments* (for the Reaſon is the ſame in *Both*), and as ſerving to clear up ſome of their other more *dubious*, or *leſs guarded* Expreſſions. Here, when an Objection was rais'd by Adverſaries[h], grounded on nothing but *Words*, and *Names*, this good Father then rejected with abhorrence any ſuch *mixture* of the *Spirit* and the *Water*, as the Catholicks were maliciouſly

[g] Καὶ ἐκ ἀθετῶν τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βάπτισμα, ταῦτα λέγω ἀλλὰ τὰς λογισμὰς καθαιρῶν τῶν ἐπαιρομένων κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ μιγνύντων τὰ ἄμικτα, καὶ παρισαζόντων τὰ ἀσυνείκιστα. Baſil. p. 30.

[h] As the Catholicks had argued juſtly for the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghoſt, from our being *baptized* into the *Spirit*, and ſanctified by the Spirit, the *Macedonians*, on the other hand, frowardly retorted, that we are baptized alſo εἰς ὕδωρ, *in*, or *into Water*, and ſanctified by *Water*; and therefore *Water* would be *divine*, by that Argument, as much as the Spirit. It was in reply to ſuch impertinent Cavils, that *Baſil* took occaſion to explain what concerned the *Water*, and what the *Spirit* in that Sacrament.

charg'd

charg'd with: And He declar'd, They were ἄμικτα, *not mix'd* with each other. At the ſame Time, He inſinuated the true meaning of all to be, that the *Spirit* and the *Water* ſo far went together[i], as to be *applied* at once to the ſame Man, in the ſame Service; but that the *Spirit* properly reſted upon the *Perſon* baptized, and not upon the outward *Element*. Had the *Romaniſts* been as careful to diſtinguiſh in the matter of the *Euchariſt*, as *Baſil* here was with reſpect to *Baptiſm*, They would have ſeen no more Reaſon for *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*, than *Baſil* could find for *Adoration* of *Water*. He rejected the latter with the utmoſt diſdain; and ſo ſhould They likewiſe have rejected the former. But I proceed. CHAP. X.

IN the ſame Treatiſe, the ſame excellent Writer ſpeaks of the *Conſecration*, or *Benediction* that paſſes upon the *Waters* of Baptiſm, analogous to that of the *Euchariſt*, which He had ſpoken of a little before. *We alſo bleſs*, ſays He, *the Water of Baptiſm, and the Oyl of Chriſm, and the Perſon likewiſe whom we baptize*[k]. But yet

[i] This is clearly expreſſed by *Nazianzen* of the ſame Time. Διπὴ ϗ ἡ κάθαρσις, διὶ ὕδατός τε φημὶ, ϗ πνεύματ☉, τὸ μὲν θεωρητῶς τε ϗ σωματικῶς λαμβανομένε, τὸ δὲ ἀτωμάτως ϗ ἀθεωρήτως συντρέχοντ☉. *Nazianz.* Orat. 40. in Baptiſm. p. 641. conf. *Greg. Nyſſ.* Tom. II. p. 801. de Baptiſm. Chriſti.

[k] Ἐυλογῶμεν ϗ τὸ τε ὕδωρ τὸ βαπτίσματ☉, ϗ τὸ ἔλαιον τ χρίσεως, ϗ προσέτι αὐτὸν τ βαπτιζόμενον. Baſil. de Sp. S. cap. 27. p. 55.

Cum veteres aiunt Sanguinem Chriſti, & Spiritum Sanctum ſe *aquæ miſcere*, populare eſt loquendi genus; quod ita capere oportet quaſi dicerent, quando aqua abluimur foris, oculis Fidei intuendum eſſe *Sanguinem* & *Spiritum* Chriſti, quia hæc cum aqua

CHAP. X. yet He underſtood the difference (as may appear from what hath been before ſaid) between the *relative* Holineſs thereupon accruing to the *Water*, or the *Oyl*, and the *Grace* of the *Spirit* accruing to the Perſon baptized. Having dwelt thus largely upon *Baſil*, who may ſerve as a Key to all the reſt, I ſhall but touch upon others who came after, contenting my ſelf with a bare *recital* of their Teſtimonies, as needing no farther Comment.

Gregory Nyſſen, of the ſame Time (*Baſil*'s younger Brother) ſpeaking of Baptiſm, ſays: "It is not the *Water* that confers this *Benefit* "(for then would it be ſuperior to the whole "Creation) but it is the Appointment of God, "and the ſupervening of the *Spirit*, myſtically "advancing to our Reſcue: However, the Wa"ter ſerves to *ſignify* the *Cleanſing* [l]. A little after He obſerves, that the Spirit inviſible being *call'd* by Faith, *comes* in a manner ineffable, and *bleſſes* both the *Perſon*, and the *Water*: And the Water ſo *bleſſed* purifies, and illuminates the Man [m]: But if the Man is not better'd, the

concurrunt, haud ſecus, ac ſi miſcerentur cum aqua. *Voſſ.* de Bapt. Diſp. V. p. 274. *Conf.* de Sacram. vi & efficacia, p. 252, 253. Tom. VI.

[l] Τοῦτην ὃ τὴν ἐνεργειαν ἐ τὸ ὕδωρ χαρίζεται, ἦν γὰρ ἂν πάσης τῆς κτίσεως ὑψηλότερον· ἀλλὰ διὰ πρόσταγμα, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις, μυστικῶς ἐρχομένη πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐλευθερίαν. ὕδωρ δὲ ὑπηρετεῖ πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τοῦ καθαρσεως. Greg. Nyſſ. in Baptiſm. Chriſti, p. 801.

[m] Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀοράτως, πίστει καλούμενον, ἀῤῥήτως παραγινόμενον —— εὐλογεῖ τὸ βαπτιζόμενον, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ βαπτίζον, p. 801. ὕδωρ εὐλογούμενον καθαίρει καὶ φωτίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, p. 803.

Water

Water is mere *Water* to Him, deſtitute of the *Spirit* [n]. CHAP. X.

ST. *Ambroſe* (or whoever is the Author) ſpeaks of the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* in Baptiſm [o]: And alſo of the *Preſence* of Chriſt, upon the ſacerdotal *Invocation* [p]. But it is remarkable, how in one Place He diſtinguiſhes the Deſcent of the Spirit upon the *Water* from the Deſcent upon the *Perſons*, and, as it were, corrects an *inaccurate* Expreſſion by one more *proper* [q], intimating what the *vulgar* way of ſpeaking really and ſtrictly meant. In another Treatiſe, He mentions the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* in Baptiſm, after the ſacerdotal *Invocation* [r]: From whence it is manifeſt that ſome *Prayer* was then uſed to be offered up for that Purpoſe, imploring ſuch *Deſcent*. The Book *De Sacramentis* is not juſtly aſcrib'd to St. *Ambroſe*: Some think, it may have been compil'd not long after Him, by ſome of his chief Admirers [s], others ſet it later. I ſhall only take notice

[n] Επὶ τέτων τὸ ὕδωρ, ὕδωρ ὄζιν, ἁδαμῶ ἢ δωρεᾶς τῦ ἁγίε πνεύματ& ἐπιφανείσης, &c. p. 540.

[o] Illis Angelus deſcendebat; Tibi Spiritus Sanctus: Illis creatura movebatur, Tibi Chriſtus operatur, ipſe Dominus creaturæ. *Ambroſ.* de Myſter. c. IV. p. 330. Edit. Bened. In hunc Fontem vis divina deſcendit. p. 331. conf. 342.

[p] Crede ergo adeſſe Dominum Jeſum, *invocatum* precibus Sacerdotum. p. 332.

[q] Non utique dubitandum eſt, quod (Spiritus) ſuperveniens *in Fontem*, vel *ſuper eos* qui Baptiſmum conſequuntur, veritatem Regenerationis operetur. *Ambroſ.* ibid. c. IX. p. 342.

[r] Quid in hoc typo Angelus, niſi *deſcenſionem* Sancti Spiritûs nunciabat, quæ noſtris futura temporibus, *aquas* Sacerdotalibus invocata precibus conſecraret? *Ambroſ.* de Sp. Sancto L. I. c. VII. p. 618.

[s] See the Editor's *Preface* to that Work. *Oudin* brings it down to

CHAP. X.

notice of a Cuſtom then prevailing, of praying for the *Preſence* of the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, in their Baptiſmal Offices; or ſometimes of the *whole Trinity* [t].

I SHALL deſcend no lower in this Account, (ſince enough has been ſaid) except it be to preſent the Reader with two or three *Forms* of the *Invocation* made in Baptiſm, beſeeching God to ſend the *Holy Spirit* to ſanctify the Baptiſmal *Waters*, or the *Perſons* to be baptized. We have not many of thoſe *Forms* remaining, in compariſon of what we have with reſpect to the other Sacrament, leſs care having been taken to preſerve, or to collect them: But we have enough for our Purpoſe. One of them occurs in the *Conſtitutions*; the oldeſt perhaps that is extant, tho' of *uncertain* Date. It runs thus: " Look down from Heaven, and *ſancti-*
" *fy* this Water: Give it *Grace* and *Power*, that
" He who is baptized therein, according to
" the command of thy Chriſt, may be crucified
" with Him, and die with Him, and be buried
" with Him, and riſe again with Him to that
" *Adoption* which comes by Him; that dying

to the VIII*th* Century, about 780. See *Oudin.* Tom. I. 1858. Some attribute it to *Maximus Taurinenſis* of the 5*th*. Vid. *Fabricius* Bibl. Med. & Infim. Latin. L. XII. p. 191.

[t] Ubi primum ingreditur Sacerdos, exorciſmum facit ſecundum Creaturam aquæ; Invocatione poſtea & precem defert, ut Sanctificetur Fons, & adſit *præſentia* Trinitatis æternæ. *Pſeud. Ambroſ.* de Sacram. L. I. c. V. p. 353.

Venit Sacerdos, precem dicit ad Fontem, invocat *patris nomen*, præſentiam *Filii*, & *Spiritus* Sancti. L. II. c. V. p. 357, 358.

The Reader may ſee more Authorities of like kind in *Albertin.* p. 465.

" unto

" unto Sin, He may live unto Righteouſneſs [u]. Here indeed no *expreſs* mention is made of the *Holy Ghoſt* the Sanctifier: But it is implied in the Word *ſanctify*, and *Grace*, and *Power*, or *Virtue*. The *Bleſſing*, we may note, is craved upon the *Water*: But as no *Grace* can properly reſt there as in its *Subject*, it is plain what all means, *viz.* that the *Perſons* ſhould receive the *Grace* of the Holy Ghoſt in the *uſe* of that *Water* according to *divine* Appointment; or that the outward waſhing and the inward Graces go together [w]. So, in common or cuſtomary Speech, when any one prays that God may *bleſs* the *means* made uſe of for any Perſon's *Recovery*, no body underſtands more in it, than that God may *bleſs* the *Perſons* in the *uſe* of thoſe means, and crown them with the *Succeſs* deſired. We have another the like *Form* in Pope *Gregory*'s *Sacramentarium*: Which how-

CHAP. X.

[u] Κάπειτα ἐξ ὕδατος, καὶ ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο· δὸς ὃ χάσιν καὶ δύναμιν, ὥστε τὸ βαπτιζόμενον, κατ' ἐντολὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ὡπῷ συσταυρωθῆναι, &c. Conſtitut. Apoſt. L. VII. c. 43. p. 384.

N. B. As to the Age of the *Conſtitutions*, Mr. *Dodwell* obſerves, that there is no evidence for them, (as we now have them in VIII Books) elder than the Time of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, who was of the Sixth Century. See *Dodwell* of *Incenſing*, p. 164. *Ittigius*, and *Buddeus* give the like Judgment. Others name the Vth Century.

Præferenda mihi reliquis videtur Sententia *Tho. Ittigii*, quarto omnino ſeculo *Conſtitutiones* quaſdam *Apoſtolicas* innotuiſſe, quæ poſtea circa *Sextum Sæculum* ab Homine quodam *Ariano* corruptæ fuerint & interpolatæ. *Buddei* Iſagog. p. 747. cont. *Turner*. Ch. XXIII. p. 237. &c. *Fabric.* Bibl. Græc. Tom. V. p. 33. Tom. XI. p. 7,—10.

[w] Accordingly, the Perſon baptized is directed, immediately after to pray for the *Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt* upon Him. Δός μοι——πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὅπως ποιήσῃς με εἰς πᾶσαν καὶ πλη-ροφορίαν τῆς ἀληθείας, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. Ibid. c. 45. p. 385.

ever

CHAP. X.

ever in its preſent State, is not altogether ſo old as that Pope; for the *Sacramentary* is not without *Interpolations* [x]. The *Form* runs thus: "Let the *Virtue* of thy *Spirit* deſcend, O Lord, "upon the Plenitude of this *Font*, and im- "pregnate all the Subſtance of this Water with "a regenerating Efficacy: Here may the Spots "of all Sins be waſhed off; here may that "Nature, form'd after thy Image, and now "reſtor'd to its original Purity, be cleanſed "from all its former Stains; that every one "coming to this *Sacrament* of *Regeneration*, "may be born again to a new Infancy of true "Innocence [y]. Here we may obſerve, that the Petition is put up for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Spirit* upon the *Waters*, as uſual, for the Benefit of the *Perſons*, that they may therein receive Remiſſion of Sins, and all other *Spiritual Graces*, for reſtoring original Righteouſneſs loſt by the Fall of *Adam*, and for ſupporting and ſuſtaining the *Chriſtian Life*.

THE *Gothick Miſſal* publiſhed by *Mabillon* [z], bearing Date as high as the eighth Century [a],

[x] Of the Age of the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, See *Dodwell* of *Incenſe* p. 218. &c.

[y] Deſcendat Domine, in hanc Plenitudinem *Fontis*, Virtus *Spiritus* tui; totamque hujus Aquæ ſubſtantiam regenerandi fœcundet effectu. Hic omnium Peccatorum maculæ deleantur, hic natura ad imaginem Dei condita, & ad Honorem ſui reformata principis, vetuſtatis cunctis ſqualoribus emundetur, omnis Homo hoc Sacramentum Regenerationis ingreſſus, in veræ innocentiæ novam Infantiam renaſcatur. *Gregor. Mag.* Lib. Sacram. p. 73. Edit. Benedict.

[z] *Mabillon* de Liturgia Gallicana p. 188. &c.

[a] See *Mabillon*. Præf. Sect. IX. And compare *Dodwell* on Incenſe p. 190.

will

will furniſh us with another *Form*; wherein the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Spirit* is directly pray'd for, to *ſanctify* the Baptiſmal *Waters*, in order to derive *Pardon* and *Grace* upon the Perſons brought to the Font [b]. I ſhall take notice of but one more, which occurs in the *Gallican Sacramentary*, of the latter End of the 8*th* Century, or thereabout [c]. There alſo *Prayer* is directly and in Terms made, that God would ſend his *Holy Spirit* upon the *Water*, in order to the purifying, and regenerating the *Perſons* coming to Baptiſm [d].

CHAP. X.

I HOPE my Readers will not think much of the *Excurſion* which I have here made into the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, with a view to illuſtrate what belongs to our preſent Subject of the *Euchariſt*. For, indeed, I know of no ſurer, or ſhorter way of coming at a juſt and clear Apprehenſion of what concerns *one*, than by comparing together and duly weighing the Circumſtances of *Both*. They are both of them

[b] Benedic Domine Deus noſter hanc creaturam *Aquæ*, & deſcendat ſuper eam virtus tua: Deſuper infunde *Spiritum* tuum, Sanctum *Paraclitum*, Angelum veritatis. Sanctifica Domine hujus Laticis undas, ſicut ſanctificaſti Fluenta *Jordanis*, ut qui in hunc Fontem deſcenderint, in nomine Patris, & Filii, & *Spiritus Sancti*, & Peccatorum veniam, & *Sancti Spiritus* Infuſionem conſequi mereantur. *Miſſal. Goth.* p. 248.

[c] See *Mabillon.* Muſ. Italic. Tom. I. in Præfat. ad Sacram. G. p. 275. *Dodwell* of Incenſe, p. 203, &c.

[d] Te Deum Patrem omnipotentem deprecamur, ut hic *Spiritum Sanctum* in *Aquam* hanc ſupermittere digneris, ut quoſcunque baptizaverimus in nomine, &c. purificans & regenerans accipias eos in numero Sanctorum tuorum, & conſummes in *Spiritu tuo Sancto* in vitam æternam, in ſæcula ſæculorum. *Sacrament. Gallican.* p. 124.

CHAP. X.

equally *Sacraments* of the Chriſtian Church, and have the like Promiſe of the *Holy Spirit*, founded in the ſame *Merits* of Chriſt's Obedience and Sufferings: There is the ſame Reaſon for a *Conſecration* of the outward *Symbols* in Both, the ſame ground for *expecting* the *Preſence* of the *Spirit*; the ſame warrant for *asking* it; the ſame *Rule* to go by, in the doing it; and the like *primitive* Practice to countenance it. If we proceed upon *favourable preſumption*, that what obtain'd univerſally, without order of *Councils*, in the *third* or *fourth* Century, (and of which there is no Memorandum left when it *began)* muſt be taken for *Apoſtolical*, then the Practice as to either Sacrament, will bear the ſame Date: But if we chuſe rather, apart from all *Conjectures*, to ſet the Practice in each no higher than we have *certain* Evidences of it, from Monuments now extant, then we muſt date the Practice with reſpect to *Baptiſm* no higher than the *third*, or however *ſecond* Century, when *Tertullian* flouriſh'd; and with reſpect to the *Euchariſt*, no higher perhaps than the *fourth*, as we ſhall ſee preſently [e].

I AM aware, that ſeveral very worthy and learned Men (and among the reſt Dr. *Grabe)* have thought of an *earlier* Date than I have juſt now mention'd; and by their united Labours and Searches into that Queſtion, have

[e] The Teſtimonies of ſuch *Invocation* in the Euchariſt are collected by *Pfaffius*, p. 374, &c. *Bingham*, XV. 3, 11. *Collier*, Reaſons, &c. p. 21, &c. *Deylingius*, Obſerv. Miſcellan. p. 196, &c. 344, &c.

enabled

enabled Thoſe that come after them, to ſee the more clearly into it. Two very learned Writers, (not to mention more now) Mr. *Pfaffius* abroad, and Mr. *Johnſon* at home, have particularly traced that matter with all the diligence imaginable, and have both of them endeavour'd to carry it up as high as there was any *colour* for carrying it. One of them appeals even to *Ignatius*, as a Voucher for the Practice [f], becauſe He makes mention of ſome Hereticks who *abſtained from the Euchariſt and Prayer, as not acknowledging the Euchariſt to be the Fleſh of Chriſt Jeſus* [g]. But I cannot ſee how by any ever ſo diſtant Conſequence, we can thence fairly conclude, that it was the Practice of that Time to *pray* for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* in the Euchariſt: For, if the *Words* of the *Inſtitution* were but uſed in the Prayer of *Conſecration*, in thoſe Days, That alone is ſufficient to account for all that *Ignatius* ſays there, or any where elſe.

CHAP. X.

Mr. *Pfaffius*, more plauſibly, endeavours to run up the Practice as high as *Irenæus* of the *ſecond* Century. And, indeed, could He have ſufficiently warranted the *Genuineneſs* of thoſe *Fragments* which he has obliged the learned World with, under the Name of *Irenæus*, there could have been no room left for farther diſpute on that Head [h]. But He has not done

[f] *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 241. alias 245. Part II. p. 180. Compare *Collier*. Reaſons, &c. p. 22. *Defence*, p. 101. &c. *Vindication*, p. 109. &c. 128. &c.

[g] *Ignat*. Ep. ad *Smyrn*. c. 7. p. 4.

[h] Vid. *Fragmenta Irenæi* ap. Pfaff. p. 27. Conf. p. 94. &c.

it;

CHAP. X.

it; neither is it, I believe, poſſible to be done[i]. As to his Argument drawn from the uſe of the Word ἔκκλησις, or ἐπίκλησις, *Invocation* of God, in *Irenæus*'s certainly *genuine* Works[k], it is too precarious a Topick to build a Thing of this moment upon; becauſe there may be an *Invocation of God* in Prayer, without any praying for the *Deſcent* of the Holy Spirit; and ἐπίκλησις is nothing but a common Name for any kind of *Invocation* in Prayer; as when the three Perſons are *named* or invoked, in the *Form* of *Baptiſm* (for ſo *Origen* uſes it[l]) or are otherwiſe named in the *Euchariſt*; as they certainly were by *Juſtin Martyr*'s Account[m]. No Proof therefore hath been yet given of the Practice of *praying* for the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, in the Euchariſtical Service, ſo early as *Irenæus*'s Days.

Mr. *Pfaffius* endeavours next[n], to make it at leaſt as ancient as the *third* Century; becauſe the *Dialogue* againſt the *Marcionites*, commonly aſcrib'd to *Origen*, or elſe to *Maximus* of the ſame Age, makes mention of the Holy Spirit's *coming upon* the Euchariſt[o]. But beſides that there is no mention of any *Prayer* for ſuch Deſcent (ſo that the Evidence here comes not

[i] Vid. *Scipio Maffeius* in Notis ad *Caſſiodori* Complex. p. 240, 241.

[k] *Iren.* p. 60, 251. Edit. Bened. Conf. *Pfaffius*, p. 96, &c.

[l] *Origen.* in Johann. p. 124. & apud *Baſil.* de Sp. S. c. 29.

[m] *Juſtin. Martyr.* Apol. I. p. 96. conf. *Cyrill. Hieroſ.* Myſtag. I. § 7. p. 308.

[n] *Pfaffius* in Præfat.

[o] Το ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἔρχεται. *Adamantius* Dialog. Sect. II. p. 826. Edit. Bened.

up

up to the Point in Queſtion) I ſay, beſides That, the Author of that *Dialogue*, moſt certainly, was neither *Origen*, nor *Maximus*, nor any of that Age, but probably, another *Adamantius*, who liv'd in the IVth Century, in the Time of *Conſtantine*; as the learned Editor in his new Edition of *Origen*, has obſerv'd at large[p]. At laſt then, we muſt be content to come down as low as the *fourth* Century, and indeed towards the *middle* of it (when the elder *Cyril* wrote) for *clear* and *undoubted* Evidence of the Practice of praying for the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit* upon the *Symbols* in the Holy Communion. No doubt but it was uſed in the Church of *Jeruſalem* before, for *Cyril* did not invent it, nor firſt uſe it: But *how long* before, is the Queſtion; which, for want of higher Records, we cannot now *certainly* determine. *Cyril* intimates part of the very *Form* of the *Invocation* then in uſe; and it may be worth the ſetting down here, for the Reader's peruſal. "We "beſeech the all-merciful God to *ſend the* "*Holy Ghoſt* upon the Elements, that He may "make the Bread Chriſt's *Body*, and the Wine "Chriſt's *Blood*. For, whatſoever the *Holy Ghoſt* "once touches, that moſt certainly, muſt be *ſan*-"*ctified*, and *changed*"[q]. That is, as to its *Uſes* or *Offices*. Some Time after, the Prieſt ſays:

CHAP. X.

[p] *Delarue* in *Admonitione* prævia, p. 800, &c.

[q] Παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον θεὸν, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀποσεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα· ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ· πάντως γὰρ ὃ ἐὰν ἐφάψηται τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μετατέθειται. *Cyrill. Myſtag.* V. c. 7. p. 327. Conf. *Albertin.* 320.

CHAP. X. "Holy are the Elements which lie before us, "having received the *Illapſe* of the *Holy Spirit:* "Holy alſo are ye, being now endowed with "the *Holy Spirit*[r]." This was ſaid before the *receiving*; which I note, for the ſake of ſome Inferences to be made from it: 1. That the *Elements* are not here made the *Conduit* of the Holy Spirit (for the Spirit is ſuppoſed to be received by the Communicants *before* them, and *without* them) but the *Service* of the Euchariſt is the *Conduit* rather, if either of them properly be ſo. 2. That the meaning of the *Prayer* for the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit*, is to invite the Spirit to come down upon the *Communicants* immediately, or principally, to make them *Holy* in a Senſe proper to them, as well as to make the *Elements* holy in a Senſe proper to Things inanimate: Therefore *Cyril* adds, *Holy Things then are meet for Holy Men.* Hence alſo came that ancient Euchariſtical Form of *Sancta Sanctis, Holy Things for Holy Men*[s], made uſe of *previouſly* to the Reception of the ſacred Symbols. 3. Though the Elements are *ſanctified* by the Holy Ghoſt, and thereupon become *relatively* Holy, as being now *ſacred* Symbols and Repreſentatives of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood*, yet they are not *beneficial* to *unholy* Perſons, but

[r] Ἅγια τὰ προκείμενα, ἐπιφοίτησιν δεξάμενα ἁγίου πνεύματος· ἅγιοι καὶ ὑμεῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου καταξιωθέντες. Τὰ ἅγια ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις κατάλληλα. Ibid. c. 19. p. 331.

[s] A full Account of it may be ſeen in *Menardus*'s Notes upon the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, p. 566. *Touttee*'s Notes on *Cyril*, p. 331. And *Bingham*'s *Eccleſ. Antiq.* Book XV. ch. III. § 31. p. 709.

hurtful,

hurtful, and therefore are not to *them* the Body and Blood of Chriſt in real Grace, Virtue, Energy, or Effect. 4. Since the Perſons are ſuppoſed to become *Holy* by the *Preſence* of the Holy Spirit, previouſly to *receiving*, in order to reap *Benefit* from it, it is plain that, as to the Requeſt for *making the Elements Chriſt's Body and Blood*, the meaning only is that they may be ſo made, not in *themſelves*, but *to the Communicants*[t], conſidered as *holy*: For, were the Elements *abſolutely* Chriſt's Body and Blood, they would be ſo both to the *Holy* and *Unholy*, which they are not. Indeed, both good and bad do receive the *conſecrated* Signs, but thoſe only who are *worthy*, do receive the *Things ſignified*.

CHAP. X.

[t] So in the Canon of the *Maſs*, and in our Communion-Service of King *Edward*'s Prayer-Book of the firſt Edition, the Words run: "*That they may become to us the Body and Blood of* "*Chriſt*." Of which Mr. *Thorndike* very judiciouſly comments, as here follows:

"Theſe Words *to us*, make an Abatement in the proper Sig-"nification of the *Body and Blood*. For the Elements may be "ſaid to become the Body and Blood of Chriſt *without Ad-*"*dition*, in the ſame *true* Senſe in which they are ſo called in the "Scriptures: But when they are ſaid to become the Body and "Blood of Chriſt *to them that communicate*, that *true* Senſe is ſo "well ſignified and expreſſed, that the Words cannot well be "underſtood otherwiſe than to import, not the *Corporal Sub-*"*ſtance*, but the *Spiritual Uſe* of them." *Thorndike* Relig. Aſſembl. p. 369.

"In the Book of the Holy Communion we do not pray *abſo-*"*lutely*, that the Bread and Wine may be *made* the *Body* and "*Blood* of Chriſt, but that *unto us*, in that Holy Myſtery, they "may be ſo: That is to ſay, that we may ſo *worthily* receive "the ſame, that we may be *Partakers* of Chriſt's Body and "Blood, and that therewith in Spirit and in Truth we may be "Spiritually nouriſhed." Abp. *Cranmer* againſt *Gardiner*, p. 79. Edit. 1580.

CHAP. X.

THE next oldeſt *Form* we meet with, after *Cyril*'s, may be that of the *Conſtitutions*, falſely called *Apoſtolical*: "We beſeech Thee, O "God, Thou that art above the *Need* of any "Thing, to look graciouſly down upon theſe "*Gifts* here lying before Thee, and to ac- "cept them favourably for the Honour of "thy Chriſt, and to *ſend thy Holy Spirit upon* "*this Sacrifice*, the Witneſs of the Sufferings "of the Lord Jeſus; that He may make this "*Bread* become the *Body* of thy Chriſt, and "this Cup become the *Blood* of thy Chriſt; "that They who partake thereof may be *con-* "*firmed* in *Godlineſs*, may obtain *Remiſſion* of "*Sins*, may be delivered from the *Devil* and "his Impoſtures, may be filled with the *Holy* "*Ghoſt*, *&c.*[v] I need not go on to later *Forms* of like kind, many of which are to be met with in the large *Collections* of *Liturgies*, publiſh'd by *Fabricius*, *Goar*, *Renaudot*, *Mabillon*, and others. The *Engliſh* Reader may find a competent Number of the ſame in a *Collection* tranſlated by ſeveral Hands, and publiſhed by the Reverend Dr. *Brett*, with ſeveral very learned and curious *Diſſertations* upon them, worth

[v] Ἀξιῶμέν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, σὺ ὁ ἀνενδεὴς θεὸς, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες αὐτοῦ βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, καὶ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῦ ῥυσθῶσι, πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρωθῶσιν. κ. τ. λ. Conſt. Apoſt. L. VIII. c. 12. p. 407.

the conſidering [w]. All I need do here, is to make ſome *general* Remarks, proper to give Light to the true and full meaning of thoſe Liturgick Forms, with reſpect to the *Deſcent*, or *Illapſe* of the *Spirit*, either upon the *Communicants*, or upon the *Symbols*. CHAP. X.

1. IT is obſervable, that the naked Symbols, before the *Spirit* is ſuppoſed to approach, or to make them *Chriſt's Body* and *Blood*, are offered up as *Gifts*, and called a *Sacrifice*. I enquire not now in *what Senſe*, deſigning a diſtinct Chapter for that Purpoſe below: But ſuch is the common Form and Tenour of moſt of the other Liturgies, *Greek* ones eſpecially; St. *James*'s [x], St. *Mark*'s [y], St. *Baſil*'s [z], and St. *Gregory*'s [a], as they are called.

2. NEXT it is obſervable, from the old Liturgies, that after the *Oblation*, and *Sacrifice*, and after the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit* upon the Symbols, to make them *authentick* and *effective* Repreſentatives of our Lord's *Body* and *Blood*, another very ſolemn Prayer was wont to be put up, pleading to God the Merits of Chriſt's *Paſſion*, and beſeeching Him, for the ſake thereof, to be *propitious* towards the *Communicants* in particular, and towards the *Church* in general. *Cyril* repreſents that Part of the Service thus: "After the finiſhing the *Spiritual*

[w] *Brett*'s Collection of the principal Liturgies, printed A. D. 1720.

[x] *Jacobi Liturg.* apud *Fabric.* p. 66. 68. 70. 82. 96.

[y] *Marci Liturg.* apud *Fabric.* p. 275. 278. 286, 287.

[z] *Baſil. Liturg.* in *Renaudot.* p. 57. 61. 68.

[a] *Gregorii Liturg.* apud. *Renaudot.* p. 90. 94, 95. 105.

CHAP. X.

" *Sacrifice*, the *unbloody Service*; over that Sacrifice of *Propitiation*, we beſeech God in behalf of the common Peace of the Churches —— we offer Chriſt *ſlain for our Sins*, intreating the all-merciful God to be *propitious* to our ſelves and others[b]." There is ſuch another Form of Prayer in the *Conſtitutions*[c]: It follows the *Oblation*, and may it ſelf be called, and often has been called, another *Oblation*. But the proper Name for it, is *Commemoration* of the *Paſſion*, now made before God, pleading the *Merit* of the ſame, in order to obtain the Fruits and Benefits of it. This part of the Service was very ancient, and moſt undoubtedly did obtain, in ſome Shape or other, even from the Beginning; purſuant to our Lord's Command, to make *Commemoration* of Him, and to St. *Paul*'s Account of the Euchariſt, as *ſhewing the Lord's Death* till his coming again. Such *Memorial* of the *Paſſion* is more than once mention'd by *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Origen*, and *Cyprian*, and *Euſebius*, and *Chryſoſtom*, and many more[d]. The meaning of the *Petition* which went along with it, was, that our Bleſſed Saviour, who is our *Interceſſor* and *Advocate* above, might vouchſafe to make thoſe Prayers acceptable at the Throne of Grace,

[b] Εἶτα, μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τ πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τ θυσίας ἐκείνης τ ἱλασμῷ παρακαλῶμεν τ θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης —— Χριστὸν ἐσφαγιασμένον ὑπὲρ τ ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν, ἱλεούμενοι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τε κ ἡμῶν φιλανθρωπον θεὸν. *Cyrill.* Myſtag. V. p. 327, 328.

[c] *Conſtitut. Apoſtol.* L. VIII. c. 13. p. 408, 409.

[d] See above. Ch. I. under the Name *Oblation*, and *Memorial*.

pleading

pleading the Intereſt of his all-prevailing Sacri- CHAP. fice in Heaven [e]. The Liturgy in *Ambroſe* X. has the like *Memorial* with the former, after the Conſecration [f]: And ſo has the *Gallican Sacramentary* [g]. The *Greek* and *Oriental* Liturgies have commonly the ſame, but not always in the ſame order; ſometimes placing the *Memorial*, or *Annunciation*, improperly, before the Conſecration [h], and again more properly, after [i]: Which is an Argument of the lateneſs of thoſe *Liturgies*, as we now have them, and of the *confuſed* State wherein moſt of them are.

3. BUT the moſt material Point of all, is to fix the true meaning of the *Invocation* and *Illapſe* of the Spirit, into which the *Greeks* commonly reſolve the *Conſecration*. The *Romiſh* Divines have frequently laid hold of what is ſaid concerning the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit*, as favourable to their Tenet of *Tranſubſtantiation*; becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is ſaid to *make* the Bread the *Body*, and the Wine the *Blood* of Chriſt. But when it came to be obſerved, that the *Greeks* conſtantly uſed that Prayer of *Invocation*, for the Deſcent of the Spirit, after the Words of the *Inſtitution* (in which the *Romaniſts* fix the *Conſecration*) a great Difficulty aroſe, how

[e] Offert ſe ipſe quaſi *Sacerdos*, ut peccata noſtra dimittat: hic in *imagine*, ibi in *veritate*, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quaſi *Advocatus* intervenit. *Ambroſius* de Offic. L. I. c. 48.

[f] *Pſeud-Ambroſius* de Sacrament. L. IV. c. 6.

[g] *Sacramentar. Gallican.* p. 280.

[h] *Jacob. Liturg.* ap. Fabric. p. 82.
Baſil. Liturg. p. 61. 68.

[i] *Jacob. Liturg.* p. 96.

CHAP. X.

to reconcile *Greeks* and *Latins*, upon the Article of *Conſecration*: For the former placed it in the *Deſcent* of the *Holy Spirit*, and the latter in the *Words* of *Inſtitution*. A Solution at length was thought on, namely, that the *Deſcent*, or *Illapſe* of the Holy Ghoſt, ſpoken of in the Greek Liturgies, ſhould not be underſtood to *make* the Symbols Chriſt's *Body*, *&c*, (being made ſuch before in Conſecration, by the Words, *This is my Body*, *&c.)* but to *make* the Reception of the Body and Blood *beneficial* and *ſalutary* to the Communicants. Many of the learned *Latins*, at the Council of *Florence*, and after, embraced the Solution with ſome Eagerneſs. *Beſſarion* alſo then, and *Arcudius* afterwards (two latinized *Greeks)* ſet themſelves to defend it, and did it with good Learning and Judgment[k]. It appears to be true, that They juſtly interpreted the Intent and Meaning of that *Invocation*, by the *beneficial* Effect of the *Illapſe* of the Spirit upon the *Communicants* in the uſe of the Symbols, and not by the Spirit's making the Symbols *abſolutely* the Body and Blood: And we are ſo far obliged to them, for pleading unawares on the *Proteſtant* Side, and thereby giving up the moſt plauſible Colours which all Antiquity could afford for the novel Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*[l].

IT muſt however be owned, that the later and ſhrewder *Romaniſts*, obſerving how their

[k] See particularly *Arcudius* de Concord. Eccl. Occident. & Orient. L. III. c. 33. p. 287, &c.

[l] See Dr. *Covel*'s Account of the Gr. Church, p. 54. *&c.*

Friends

Friends were caught in their own Snare, have been very ſolicitous to retract that occaſional *Conceſſion*, and to condemn *Beſſarion*, *Arcudius*, and others for giving into it. *Lequien* is one of thoſe who endeavour to recall the Grant [m]; and *Renaudot* is another [n]; and *Touttee* a third [o]. They are juſtly ſenſible, how their moſt ſpecious Pretences from the *Ancients* are at once taken from them, and that the *Proteſtant* Cauſe is now triumphant, in that Article, even upon their own *Conceſſions*. Their perceiving it with ſuch *concern* does not at all abate the Force of what *Beſſarion*, and *Arcudius*, and many more of their Friends very learnedly and juſtly pleaded for the original Meaning of that *Form*. All Circumſtances ſhew, that the true and ancient Intent of that Part of the Service, was not to implore any *phyſical* Change in the Elements, no nor ſo much as a phyſical *Connexion* of the *Spirit* with the *Elements*, but a *moral* Change only in the *Elements*, as to *Relations* and Uſes, and a *gracious* Preſence of the Holy Spirit upon the *Communicants*.* CHAP. X.

[m] *Lequien* in Notis ad *Damaſcen*. Tom. I. p. 269.

[n] Quod aiunt *Beſſarionis* & *Arcudii* Imitatores totam orationem referri ad *fructuoſam* myſterii ſuſceptionem, ferri non poteſt. —— Unde ſequeretur *nullam* eſſe *Tranſmutationem* erga indigne communicantes, quæ germaniſſima eſt *Proteſtantium* Doctrina. —— Si hæc ad ſolam *fructuoſam* communionem referantur, nulla magis commoda *Proteſtantium* Cauſæ Interpretatio excogitari poterat. *Renaudot*. Liturg. Orient. Tom. II. p. 93.

[o] Verba hæc detorquere ad *effectus* Euchariſtiæ in nobis poſtulandos, *Eccleſiam* luculentiſſimo, antiquiſſimo, & conſtantiſſimo *Tranſubſtantiationis* Teſtimonio privare eſt. *Touttee* Cyrillian. Diſſertat. III. p 238.

* Vid. *Fulgent*. ad Monim. Lib. II. c. 9, 10.

ONE

CHAP. X.

ONE Argument of it may be drawn from the Style of the Prayer, *ſuper nos* [p] *& ſuper hæc dona*, begging the Deſcent upon the *Communicants* firſt, and then upon the *Elements*; that is to ſay, upon the Communicants in the *uſe* of thoſe now *holy* or *conſecrated* Symbols. *Renaudot* would perſuade us, that the *ſuper nos* relates to the Conſecrators, or to the officiating *Clergy* [q]. But what I have before cited from St. *Cyril*, as underſtanding the *Deſcent* of the *Spirit* to be upon the *Communicants* in general, is a ſufficient Confutation of every ſuch ſurmiſe.

ANOTHER Argument of what I am here pleading for, may be drawn from the Reſtriction *to us*, inſerted in that Form, in ſeveral Liturgies; particularly in the *Gregorian Sacramentary* [r], and from thence derived to the *Canon* of the *Maſs*. I have ſhewn the Meaning of it before, and need not here repeat.

BUT the cleareſt and ſtrongeſt Argument of all, may be drawn from the like *Form* of Invocation in the *Baptiſmal* Offices; where it is certain that it could mean only a *moral* Change of the *Water* as to *Uſe* and *Office*, not a *phyſical* Change of its Subſtance. Why ſhould the *Illapſe* of the Holy Spirit be ſuppoſed to work any greater, or any other *Change* in the

[p] See the *Liturgies* in *Fabricius*, 68. 84, 85. 98. 204, 205. 243. 298. 300. or in *Renaudotius*, Tom. I. p. 16. 31. 46. 48. 68. 105. Tom. II. p. 118. 143. 313. 325.

[q] *Renaudot*. Liturg. Orient. Tom. I. p. 340.

[r] Quam oblationem Tu, Deus, in omnibus quæſumus benedictam —— facere digneris, ut *Nobis* Corpus & Sanguis fiat, *&c.*

Elements

Elements of the *Euchariſt*, than in the *Waters* of *Baptiſm*[s]? CHAP. X.

Renaudot, being aware of this Difficulty, offers a kind of Salvo for it; Namely, that tho' the Spirit is invited to come down upon the *Waters* in Baptiſm, yet He comes not to change the Waters into Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, but to give *Regeneration* and *Remiſſion* to the Perſons. He obſerves likewiſe, that when the Spirit is *invoked* upon the *Oyl*, or *Chriſm*, or Perſons to be *ordained*, or whatever elſe is to be *conſecrated*, it amounts only to a Petition for the *Grace* of the *Spirit* upon the Parties concerned; which is quite another Thing from *changing* the Symbols in the Euchariſt into the *Body* and *Blood*[t]. But this appears to be begging the Queſtion, or rather to be giving up the main Thing: For, what we aſſert is, that the *Ancients* ſuppoſed the like *Illapſe* of the *Spirit*, and like *Change* wrought in the *Waters* of Baptiſm, and in the *Oyl*, and *Chriſm*, &c. as in the *Ele-*

[s] Compare what Mr. *Pfaffius* has well urged on this Head, p. 76, &c. Tho' it muſt be ſaid, that his own *Hypotheſis* will no more clear this Article, than the Popiſh one can: For the *Invocation* in Baptiſm draws down nothing but what is *Spiritual*.

[t] Invocatur quoque ut mittat *Spiritum Sanctum* ſuper *Aquas* Baptiſmales, ut in illis Baptizati accipiant *Regenerationem*, omniumque Peccatorum *Remiſſionem*: ſuper *Oleum*, & *Chriſma*, ut *Gratiam* Baptizatis *novam* conferant: ſuper *Ordinandos*, ut accipiant *Sanctimoniam* & *Poteſtatem* ad ſacra miniſteria ſanctè exercenda: Super *Oleum Infirmorum*, ut ejus Unctio *proſit* infirmis ad *ſalutem* Animæ & Corporis. —— Verum in *Euchariſtia* conſecranda, aliud quiddam ſe petere deſignant, nempe Illapſum efficacem Spiritûs Sancti in dona propoſita, ut *mutentur* & *transferantur* in *Corpus* & *Sanguinem* Domini: quod de *Aqua*, *Chriſmate*, *Oleoque*, aliiſque Sacramentis, nunquam poſtulaſſe *Orientales* reperiuntur. *Renaudot*. Tom. I. p. 196, 197.

ments

CHAP. X.

ments of the Euchariſt; and therefore if in thoſe it amounted only to a *moral* or *ſpiritual* Change, it cannot, upon their Principles, amount to more in this. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, as before quoted, plainly makes thoſe ſeveral Caſes ſo far parallel[u]; and ſo does *Gregory Nyſſen*[w] after Him: Therefore Mr. *Renaudot*'s Conceſſions turn upon Himſelf, and recoil upon his own Hypotheſis. It is not indeed ſaid, that the Holy Ghoſt in Baptiſm converts the Water into *Body* and *Blood*; neither is it ſaid, that the Holy Ghoſt in the Euchariſt converts the Symbols into *Water of Life*, or into a *celeſtial Garment*: Each Sacrament has its diſtinguiſhing Style and Title, proper to the *Symbols* of it, and to the *Reſemblance* intended in it. For, tho' they exhibit the *ſame Graces*, yet they do it not under the ſame *Types*, *Figures*, or *Symbols*: And that is the ſole Reaſon of the *different* Style here, and there. There is the ſame *Change* wrought in Both, and by the ſame *divine* Power, and to the ſame *ſalutary*

[u] See above, Ch. VII. p. 242.
Compare *Bingham*, Book XI. ch. 10. § 4.

[w] *Gregor. Nyſſen*, de Baptiſmo Chriſti, Tom. II. p. 801, 802. Ed. Pariſ. 1615. Dr. *Covel* has obſerved the ſame at large, with reſpect to the *later* Rituals, in his *Account of the Greek Church*, p. 53, &c. And tho' He intended the *Inſtances* there given, only to ſhew, that ſuch *Forms* implied no *phyſical* Change in the Things ſo *conſecrated*, yet they really prove more, *viz.* That the *Holy Spirit* was ſuppoſed to reſt upon the *Perſons* in the *uſe* of the *Symbols*, and not upon the *Symbols* themſelves, in ſtrictneſs of Speech. I may note alſo, that in p. 56, 57. he has fully confuted the moſt ſpecious Pretence which the *Romaniſts* commonly make from ſome corrupt Copies of *Baſil*'s Liturgy, by producing a truer Reading out of a different Copy near 600 Years old.

Purpoſes.

Purpoſes. There is the ſame kind of Prayer in Both, for the ſame kind of *Illapſe*, or *Preſence* of the Spirit, and for the ſame kind of *Grace*, *Virtue*, and *Efficacy*, whether upon the *Symbols*, or *Recipients*. If we *feed upon* Chriſt in the Euchariſt, we *put Him on* in Baptiſm, which comes to the ſame Thing in the main. If we are Partakers of the *Spiritual Lamb* there, ſo are we alſo here. If we *drink* his Blood there, we are *dipped* in his Blood here, which is tantamount. Nay, we are *Partakers* of the Body and Blood in Both, according to the Principles of the ancient Writers. Teſtimonies to that effect have often been collected by learned *Proteſtants*: And therefore, for the avoiding of prolixity, I chooſe rather to refer [x], than to repeat. Such being the certain Doctrine of the *Ancients*, it is a vain Attempt, to ſtrain any Expreſſions of theirs concerning the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit* in the Euchariſt, beyond what They admitted in the other Sacrament. The Subſtance of what They taught is the ſame with reſpect to Both, only in *different Phraſes*, as the *difference* of the *Symbols* required: For, *Baptiſm* is not the *Euchariſt*, tho' it exhibits the ſame Graces, and does the ſame Thing, and by the ſame Powers, that the *Euchariſt* does.

CHAP. X.

FROM the Account here given, I may take notice, by the way, of the Wiſdom of our

[x] Biſhop *Moreton* on the Sacrament, p. 568, &c.
Albertinus, p. 223. 426.
Bingham, Book XI. ch. 16. § 4.

firſt

CHAP. X.

first *Reformers*, who, while They thought of inſerting any Prayer at all for the *Illapſe* of the *Spirit*, reſolved to do it equally and indifferently in *both* the *Offices*; as well in the Office of *Baptiſm*[y], as in the Office for the *Communion*[z]: For there is, undoubtedly, as much Reaſon, and as great Authority for it with reſpect to the former, as there is with reſpect to the latter. Indeed, they were Both thrown out afterwards, upon *prudential* Conſiderations, and at the Inſtance chiefly of two learned and judicious Foreigners, whom Archbiſhop *Cranmer* called in to aſſiſt at the Review of our Liturgy in 1551[a]. It was thought perhaps, as there was no expreſs *Scripture Precept*, nor any clear Proof of *Apoſtolical Practice*, either for this Form, or another, that therefore every Church was at Liberty in ſuch Caſes. It might be conſidered farther, that ſeveral Centuries probably

[y] In King *Edward*'s firſt *Prayer-Book*, A. D. 1549. "O moſt "merciful God our Saviour Jeſu Chriſt —— upon whom being "baptized in the River of *Jordan*, the Holy Ghoſt came down "in the likeneſs of a Dove, ſend down, we beſeech Thee, the "ſame thy Holy Spirit, to aſſiſt us, and to be *preſent* at this our "*Invocation* of thy Holy Name. Sanctify this Fountain of Bap"tiſm, &c.

[z] "Hear us, O merciful Father, we beſeech Thee, and with thy "*Holy Spirit* and *Word*, vouchſafe to bleſs and ſanctify theſe thy "Gifts, and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that They may be *unto* "*us* the Body and Blood of thy moſt dearly beloved Son Jeſus "Chriſt.

N. B. If it ſhould be aſked, how they are ſo *unto us*, if they be not firſt *abſolutely* ſo? *Anſw.* They are ſaid to be ſo *unto us*, when the *beneficial Effect* goes along with them. See *Cranmer*, and *Thorndike*, cited above, p. 403.

[a] See *Wheatly* on the Common Prayer, p. 26. *Collier*, Vindic. of Reaſ. and Def. p. 150.

had paſſed, before there were any publick *written* Liturgies at all: And the Biſhops commonly, in and for their reſpective Churches, had been left to draw up ſuch Forms as they judged moſt proper to Times and Circumſtances, conformable to the Analogy of Faith[b]. And ſince an ill uſe had often been made, by *Romaniſts*, of thoſe Words of the Communion-Office, in favour of *Tranſubſtantiation*[c] (for which there appeared ſome *Colour*, tho' *Colour* only, and owing to Miſconſtruction and wrong Inferences) *Prudence* might require ſome Alteration, under ſuch Circumſtances. However, in our preſent Offices, we have ſome *Remains* of the ancient way of praying for the aſſiſtance of the *Holy Spirit* in both Sacraments. In our Office of *Publick Baptiſm*, we have the *Invocation* couched under *general* Expreſſions: The People are admoniſhed to call upon God the Father, that the Child brought to the Font may be baptized with Water *and the Holy Ghoſt*. Then again, *ſanctify him with the Holy Ghoſt*, and *give thy Holy Spirit to this Infant:* And as to the outward Element, *ſanctify this Water to the myſtical waſhing away of Sin*. Theſe Paſſages, penned in a more reſerved, general way, do yet really contain all that the more ancient *Invocation* in Baptiſm amounted to.

CHAP. X.

[b] See *Bingham*, Book I. ch. 19. § 17. Book XIII. ch. 5. § 1 Book II. ch. 6. § 2. *Renaudot*. Tom. I. p. 9.

[c] See *Cranmer*, p. 325. Dr. *Aldrich*, Reply to two Oxford Diſcourſes, p. 8, 9.

CHAP. X.

IN our *Communion-Service*, the *Invocation* is more obſcurely intimated under a *few*, and thoſe *general* Terms: *Grant that we receiving theſe thy Creatures of Bread and Wine — may be Partakers of his moſt precious Body and Blood*[d]. This was part of the ancient *Invocation*; and it expreſſes the Thing formerly prayed for, without ſpecifying the particular *Manner*, or *Means*, viz. the immediate *Operation* of the *Holy Spirit*: Tho' that alſo muſt of courſe be underſtood and implied, upon Chriſtian Principles taught in Scripture. After all, I ſee no Reaſon why it may not be juſtly thought as *modeſt*, and as *reverent*, to beg of God the Father the *Things* which we *want*, underſtanding that He will grant them *by his Holy Spirit*, as to make a formal Petition to Him, to *ſend his Holy Spirit* upon the Elements, or upon the Communicants; unleſs Scripture had particularly ordered ſome ſuch *ſpecial* Form, to be made uſe of in our Sacramental Solemnities, which it has not done[e].

IT muſt be owned, that there was ſomething very *affecting* and *awful* in many of the

[d] That is, Partakers of the *Merits* and *Virtue* of the Body as crucified, and Blood as ſpilled; and *Partakers* alſo of the ſame Body conſidered as *raiſed* again, and *myſtically* united with *worthy* Receivers.

[e] Mirum in hiſce, aliiſque Orientalium Liturgiis, conſenſum videas circa *invocationem Spiritûs Sancti*, ut dona faciat Corpus & Sanguinem Chriſti: De hac Liturgica Invocatione tamen in genuinis Apoſtolorum Scriptis ne γεύ. *Fabricius*, Cod. Apocr. Nov. Teſt. Part. 3. in Præfatione.

Nos equidem illam Spiritus S. ἐπιφοίτησιν neque ad Symbolorum Conſecrationem *neceſſariam*, nec *exorandam*, nec Græcorum Liturgiam ea in parte *defendendam*, aut *imitandam* eſſe arbitramur.

Deylingius, Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 199.

ancient

ancient Forms, apt to ſtrike the Minds of an Aſſembly, and to raiſe their devout Affections, when properly executed with a becoming Dignity, by grave and venerable Men. Such was that prefatory Part in ſeveral old Liturgies, *How dreadful is this Seaſon*, &c. made uſe of juſt before the expected coming of the *Holy Spirit*, in order to prepare every humble Communicant to wait for it with the moſt profound Reverence, and moſt exalted Devotions. But it may be doubted, whether ſuch Forms are proper at *all Times*, and in *all Circumſtances*; and whether they might not, in ſome Circumſtances, rather obſtruct, than further the good Ends deſigned by them. The more general and reſerved method is certainly the leſs affecting; but yet it may be, all Things conſidered, the ſureſt way to keep up the *Dignity* of the Sacraments among the Generality, and to ſecure the ſacred Offices from Contempt. But I have ſaid enough of this matter, which came in only by the way. CHAP. X.

WHILE I am ſpeaking of our excellent *Liturgy*, it may not be amiſs to take notice of another Article relating to this Head, wherein it may appear to ſome *ſhort* and *defective*. It is very certain, that the *Commemoration*, *Memorial*, or *Annunciation* of our Lord's *Paſſion*, with an Addreſs to God for his *propitious* Favour thereupon, has been a very ancient, eminent, and ſolemn Part of the Communion-Service. There is now no direct formal Application of that kind in our Offices. There

CHAP. X.

was in King *Edward*'s Liturgy of 1549. in theſe Words: "We thy humble Servants do cele-"brate and make here before thy divine Ma-"jeſty with theſe thy holy Gifts, *the Memo-"rial* which thy Son has willed us to make, "having in *Remembrance* his bleſſed *Paſſion*, "mighty *Reſurrection*, *&c.*" Why this Part was ſtruck out in the *Review*, I know not; unleſs it was owing to ſome Scruple (which however was needleſs) about making the Memorial *before God*, which at that Time might appear to give ſome umbrage to the Popiſh *Sacrifice*, among ſuch as knew not how to diſtinguiſh. However that were, we have ſtill the Sum and Subſtance of the Primitive *Memorial* remaining in our preſent Offices; not all in a Place, but interſperſed here and there in the *Exhortations*, and *Prayers*. In a previous Exhortation, we read: "Above all Things ye "muſt give moſt humble and hearty Thanks "to God the Father, *&c.* for the Redemption "of the World by the *Death* and *Paſſion* of "our Saviour Chriſt both *God* and *Man*, &c." There is the Senſe and Signification of the antient *Memorial*, only under a different Form. In the *Poſt-Communion*, we beſeech God "to "accept our *Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiv-"ing*, and to grant *Remiſſion* of *Sins to us* and "to *the whole Church*, by the *Merits* and *Death* "of Chriſt Jeſus." Which Words contain the Subſtance of what was anciently the Appendage to the *Memorial*. There was beſides, in moſt

moſt of the old Liturgies[f], a particular Petition added, that the *Angels* might carry up our Prayers to the *High Altar* in Heaven; and this alſo was inſerted in King *Edward*'s firſt Liturgy, but ſtruck out at the firſt *Review*. As to the *Altar in Heaven*, I ſhall have occaſion to ſay more in a Chapter below, and therefore paſs it over here. As to the Notion of *Angels* conveying the *Prayers* of the Supplicants to the Throne above, I know not whether it had any better grounds than the Authority of the Apocryphal Book of *Tobit*[g], as *Bucer* obſerved[h]. It ſeems to have been originally a *Jewiſh* Notion[i]; tho' a late learned Writer chooſes rather to derive it from the *Platonick Philoſophy*[k]: I think, improperly; for it will be hard to prove, that *Plato* was before *Tobit*, or before the Book bearing his Name[l]. Beſides that the *Pagans* were more likely to borrow ſuch Things from *Jews*, than the *Jews* from them. But be that as it will, ſince the Notion has no certain warrant in *Canonical* Scripture, it was prudent to ſtrike it out of our Church Offices. Upon the whole, tho' all Human Compoſitions muſt have their *Defects*, more or leſs, I am

[f] See in *Fabricius*'s Collection, p. 36. 54. 70. 96. 147. 173. 206. 234. 265. 273. and in *Renaudot*'s paſſim. Compare *Apoſtol. Conſtit.* Lib. VIII. cap. 13. and *Pſeud-Ambroſ.* de Sacram. Lib. IV cap. 6.

[g] *Tobit* XII. 15.

[h] *Bucer*, Script. Anglican. p. 473.

[i] Conf. *Teſtamentum Levi*, in Grab. Spicileg. Tom. I. p. 159.

[k] *Elſner.* in Græc. Teſtam. Tom. II. p. 117.

[l] Of *Tobit*, ſee *Prideaux*'s Connection, Part I. p. 39. Fol. Edit. *Fabric.* Bibl. Græc. L. III. c. 29. *Dupin.* Can. of the Old Teſt. p. 89.

CHAP. X.

perſuaded, that our *Communion-Service*, as it now ſtands, is as grave, and ſolemn, and as judicious, as any other that can be named, be it ancient or modern. It may *want* ſome Things which were *well inſerted* in other Offices; but then it has *well left out* ſeveral other Things, which moſt Liturgies are rather *burdened* with, than *benefited*. But I return.

As to the main Point now in hand, it is very plain from all *Liturgies*, and from all kinds of ancient *Teſtimonies*, that the *Chriſtian World* has all along believed, that the *Spirit* of *God* is inviſibly *preſent*, and operates *effectually* in both Sacraments; as well to confer a *relative Holineſs* upon the outward *Symbols*, as to convey the *Grace* of *Sanctification* to the faithful Recipients. Therefore the *Socinians* ſtand condemned, as to this Article, by *all Churches*, ancient or modern, as well as by *Scripture* itſelf, and the plaineſt Reaſon: Neither have They any Plea to offer on that Side, which carries ſo much as the Face of a *direct* Argument. I am aware, that they may have ſomething to plead *obliquely*, while arguing againſt the *Exiſtence*, or *Perſonality*, or *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, or againſt any *ordinary* Operations from above upon the Minds of Men, to *enlighten*, or *ſanctify* them: And whatever They may have to plead in reſpect to thoſe *previous* Points, will *remotely* affect the *preſent* Queſtion. But it is not my Buſineſs here, to run out into thoſe *preliminary* Enquiries, almoſt *foreign* to the *particular* Subject I am upon, and fitter to make diſtinct

and ſeparate Treatiſes, than to be brought in here. As to *direct* Arguments, I can think of few or none[m] at preſent, unleſs we may reckon that for one, which charges our Doctrine in this Particular, as making the Sacraments *Charms*, and *Spells*; an Objection built upon manifeſt Calumny or Miſconception, and looking more like Buffoonery than ſerious Argument, eſpecially as worded by ſome of that Side. One of them writes thus: "When St. "*Auſtin* defined a *Sacrament* to be the *outward* "*viſible Sign of an inward inviſible Grace*, or "*Energy*, the good Father ſhould have conſi- "dered, that this is a Definition of *a Charm*, "not of a Goſpel-Sacrament: For, a *Charm* "is a bare outward viſible Sign, that which "has no *natural* or *real* Agreement with the "Effect. —— They have turned the Goſpel- "Sacraments into *Charms* and *Spells*[n]." The ſame trifling Impertinence might as juſtly be urged againſt *Naaman*'s being healed of his Leproſy by waſhing in *Jordan*[o]; or againſt *Hezekiah*'s being cured by a *Lump* of *Figs*[p]; or againſt the *Blind* Man's receiving Sight by the means of *Clay* and *Spittle*, and waſhing in the

CHAP. X.

[m] The Argument drawn againſt *preſent* Benefits from the Word *Remembrance* has been obviated above, Ch. IV. p. 107. I ſhall only hint farther, that *remembering*, in this Caſe, is not oppoſed to a Thing's being *preſent*, but to its being *forgot*, as Spiritual and inviſible Benefits eaſily may, though near at hand all the time. Vid. *Nourrii* Apparat. Tom. I. p. 411.

[n] *Trinitarian Scheme of Religion*, pag. 24, 25. printed in the Year 1692.

[o] 2 *Kings* V. 14.

[p] 2 *Kings* XX. 7. *Iſaiah* XXXVIII. 21.

CHAP. X.

Pool of *Siloam*[q]. We place no more Virtue in the naked Symbols, than in the meaneſt Inſtruments whatever, which God may at any Time pleaſe to make uſe of, and ſanctify to high and holy Purpoſes. Thoſe Inſtruments in themſelves do nothing: It is God that does all, in and thro' the appointed *Uſe* of them. He that blaſphemes or derides the certain Workings of God, or of the Spirit of God, upon the Souls or Bodies of Men, under the Names of *Charms*, *Spells*, *Inchantments*, or the like (as the *Jews* derided our Lord's Miracles) ſeems to forget the Reverence due to divine Majeſty, and the Reſpect which we owe to high and holy Things. But to put the kindeſt and moſt favourable Conſtruction we can upon the Objection as here worded, it is charging St. *Auſtin*, and all the *primitive* Churches, and their Followers, with what they are notoriouſly known, not only never to have taught, but conſtantly to have diſclaimed. They never do attribute to the *bare Elements* the Works of *Grace*, but conſtantly aſcribe them to the powerful *Hand of God*, working in, or with the Elements. If that be working by *Charms* or *Spells*, let any Man tell us, what *ſupernatural*, or *preternatural* Works of God are not as juſtly liable to the ſame Imputation.

IF the Purport of the Objection be to reject all ſuch *divine* Operations as we here ſuppoſe, upon *moral* Agents, as not conſiſtent with Human *Liberty*; that is a more *general* Queſtion,

[q] *John* IX. 7.

previous

previous to what we are now upon, and therefore in a great measure *foreign* to the Point in hand. It is sufficient to say, that the *general* Doctrine of *Grace* is so fully established in the New Testament, that no *Christian* can consistently reject it. As to the *manner* of it, it is not for us to presume to explain it: But we are certain it is wrought in a *moral* way, in a way consistent with *moral* Agency and Human *Liberty*. We know the Fact: we need no more. If any Man will undertake to demonstrate *à priori*, that there can be no *Medium* between *irresistible* Impressions and *none at all*, or that God cannot *sanctify*, or *purify*, or *enlighten* the Soul of Man, in any degree, without making Him a *Machine*, he may perhaps deserve to be heard; but in the mean while, Scripture, express Scripture, will deserve our attention, and will command the Faith of every true Disciple of Christ.

SOME perhaps may think it an Objection to what has been here pleaded, that *Grace* is also promised sometimes to *Prayer*, sometimes to *Faith*, and sometimes to *Hearing*, and therefore is not *peculiar* to the *Sacraments*: For it has been suggested, that *the Spiritual eating of Christ, is* COMMON *to all Places, as well as to the Lord's Table*[r]. This I have touched upon before*, and shall only add here, that we do not *confine* God's Grace to the *Sacraments*; neither do we assert any *peculiar* Grace, as *ap-*

[r] *Hales's* Tracts, p. 57. * *See above*, p. 289, &c.

CHAP. X.

propriate to them only: But what we aſſert is, ſome peculiar *degree* of the ſame *Graces*, or ſome peculiar *certainty*, or *conſtancy* as to the Effect, in the due uſe of thoſe means[f]. And if the divine Graces, more or leſs, go along with all the divine Ordinances, well may they be ſuppoſed to go along with thoſe, which are the moſt ſolemn and moſt exalted of any, and have alſo more of a *federal* Nature in them; as has been hinted above[t], and will be proved at large in the Chapter here following.

CHAP. XI.

Of the federal or covenanting Nature of the Holy EUCHARIST.

IT is the prevailing Doctrine of *Divines*, that the Service of the Holy Communion carries in it ſomething of a *federal* Nature, is a kind of *covenanting* or *ſtipulating* Act; not making a new Covenant, but covenanting anew, confirming or renewing the Stipulation before entred into at our *Baptiſm*. For the clearing of this important Point, it will be proper, 1. To premiſe ſomething of *Covenants* in general between God and Man. 2. To ſpecify the ancient Forms or Methods of contracting, under the Old Teſtament. 3. To deſcend to the

[f] *Verbum* & *Sacramenta* in eo conveniunt, quod ambo *Gratiam Regenerationis* offerant & exhibeant: ſed quod nonnunquam Sacramentis *peculiariter* adſcribi videtur, id inde eſt, quod Fides, in Sacramentis, hanc Gratiam videat *clariùs*, apprehendat *fortiùs*, teneat *certiùs*. *Voſſ.* de Sacram. p. 251.

[t] *See above*, p. 290, 291.

later

later Forms of doing the ſame Thing under the New Teſtament, by the Sacraments thereunto belonging, *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*. CHAP. XI.

1. THE Divine Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion is ſuch, in all his Dealings with Mankind, that He conſiders always what is beſt for them, and may moſt help their Infirmities. With theſe gracious Views (while He is abſolute Lord over them, and might iſſue out his ſovereign Commands to all, without admitting any Mortal to contract for Rewards, or to ſtrike any League with Him) He is pleaſed to enter into *Covenants* with Men, giving and taking Aſſurances, and, as it were, binding both Himſelf and them, in order to draw them the more ſtrongly to Him, and to engage them to look after their own everlaſting Happineſs. Not that God thereby diveſts Himſelf of his Right over them, or that Men have a *Right* to refuſe the Covenant propoſed to them, or would not be juſtly *puniſhable* for ſuch refuſal[v]: For indeed they are under a previous indiſpenſable Obligation to comply; and the refuſing it would deſerve very ſevere Puniſhment[w]. But the entring into Covenant produces a cloſer Relation, and a ſtronger Tie, and is much more engaging and attractive many ways, than naked Precepts could be[x]; as will be evident of it-

[v] See *Pufendorf*, Jus feciale Divinum. Sect. XX. p. 92. &c. Lat. Edit. p. 87. Engl. Edit. Abp. *Potter* on Ch. G. p. 12, &c.

[w] *Matt.* X. 14, 15. XXII. 7. *Luke* XIV. 21. — 24.

[x] Vid. *Hoornbeeck* de Fœdere Eccleſiaſtico. Exercit Theolog. Tom. III. p. 640.

ſelf

CHAP. XI.

ſelf to any Man that reflects, and I need not enlarge upon it.

IN Covenants between *God* and *Man*, there is not, as in common Covenants, an *equal* and *mutual* Meeting of each other, or a joint Concurrence: But God is the *firſt mover* to invite and propound; and Man comes in after, ſooner or later, to accept and conclude. *We love* God, *becauſe He firſt loved us: Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us*[y]. And our Lord ſays to his Diſciples: *Ye have not* firſt *choſen me, but I have* firſt *choſen you, &c*[z]. Another Thing obſervable is, that there are not here, as in Covenants between Man and Man, *mutual* Advantages, or Benefits *reciprocal*; but all the Advantage or Benefit, properly ſo called, accrues to one Party only, becauſe the other is too perfect to receive any. Nevertheleſs, there is ſomething *analogous* to Benefits, or what may be *conſidered* as ſuch, accruing to the Divine Majeſty; namely external *Honour* and *Glory*, and ſuch *Delight* as He is conceived conſtantly to enjoy in the Exerciſe of his *Goodneſs*, *Wiſdom*, *Power*, and other his Attributes or Perfections. Neither does this *circumſtantial* Difference, ariſing from the infinite *Diſparity* of the Parties contracting, at all affect the *Eſſence* of the Covenant ſuppoſed to be made between them. For a Covenant is, in its general Nature (as Baron *Pufendorf* defines it[a]) an Union, Conſent, and Agreement

[y] 1 *John* IV. 19. 10. [z] *John* XV. 16.
[a] *Pufendorf*, ibid. Sect. XX.

of

of two Wills about the ſame Thing[a]: And if God propoſes ſuch and ſuch Terms, and Man accepts them, there is then a *formal* Covenant ſtruck between them. God *conditionally* offers Advantages on his Side; and Man covenants to pay a ſuitable *Homage*, *Adoration*, and *Service*, as required.

THAT God has tranſacted, and does yet daily tranſact *Covenants* with Mankind in Succeſſion, ſhall be ſhewn preſently. Only I may here hint by the way, that many conſiderable Divines have ſuppoſed alſo a *previous* Covenant between God the *Father* and God the *Son*, in the Affair of Man's Salvation. There are ſeveral Things hinted in Holy Scripture, which look like an *Agreement*, or *Covenant*, that upon our Lord's undertaking to be *Mediator*, and performing what belongs to it, a *Reconciliation* ſhould enſue between God the Father and Mankind. The Texts, which chiefly ſeem to countenance that Notion, are collected into one View by the excellent *Pufendorf*, to whom, for brevity ſake, I chooſe to refer the Reader[b].

2. I PROCEED to obſerve, that God has Time after Time tranſacted *Covenants* with Men, and under various Formalities. There was a *Covenant of Life* made with Man in Paradiſe, in

[a] Conf. *Deylingius* Obſerv. Sacr. Tom I. p. 328, 329. *Zornius* Opuſc. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 240.

[b] *Pufendorf*, Jus fecial. Sect. XXXVII. p. 144. Lat. p. 129. Eng. Edit. Conf. *Dodwell*, Diſſ. Cyprian. p. 448. *Zornius* Opuſc. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 240, 241, 242. In *Zornius* may be ſeen References to a Multitude of Writers, who have conſidered that Article.

his

CHAP. XI.

his State of Innocency [c]; which commonly goes under the Name of the *Firſt Covenant*, or *Old Covenant*, and which continued for a very ſhort Space. To that immediately ſucceeded the *Second Covenant*, or *New Covenant*, called alſo the *Covenant of Grace*, and made with lapſed Man, in and thro' Chriſt Jeſus. It commenced from *old Time*, in the World's Infancy, as St. *Paul* teſtifies [d]; tho' not clearly revealed, nor fully executed till the Days of the Goſpel, but *conſidered* as executed from the beginning, ſo far forth as to be available for the Remiſſion of Sin, in all Ages, to Men fitly qualified according to the Terms of it. Beſides theſe two eminent and general Covenants, God entred into other *inferior* or more *ſpecial* Covenants (together with *Renewals* alſo of this) as with *Noah* [e], with *Abraham* [f], with *Iſaac* [g], with *Jacob* [h], with *Moſes* and *Aa-*

[c] See this *proved* and *explained* by Bp. *Bull*, Appendix ad Animad. XVII. and *Diſcourſe concerning the firſt Covenant*. Opp. Poſth. Vol. III. p. 1065, &c. Compare *Pufendorf*, Jus fecial. Sect. XXIV.

[d] *Tit.* I. 2. Πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, Before ancient Times. Vid. *Bull*, Opp. Poſth. Vol. II. p. 591. Conf. *Rom.* XVI. 25. *Coloſſ.* I. 26. 1 *Pet.* I. 20.

[e] *Gen.* VI. 18. IX. 9 ——— 18. In the firſt Inſtance, there was *expreſs* Engagement on one Side, *tacite* on the other. See *Le Clerc* in loc. In the Second, there appears to have been no more than *ſimple Engagement* on one Side. But in the Inſtances following, there were *mutual* or *reciprocal* Engagements, tacite or expreſs.

[f] *Gen.* XII. 2, 3. XV. 18. XVII. 2 ——— 22. *Eccluſ.* XLIV. 20.

[g] *Gen.* XVII. 19. XXI. 2. XXVI. 2, 3. *Eccluſ.* XLIV. 22. *Pſal.* CV. 9.

[h] *Gen.* XXVIII. 13, 14. 20, 21, 22. XXXV. 9, &c. *Eccluſ.* XLIV. 23.

ron,

ron [i], and with *Phinehas* [k], and their Families after them. The *Legal Covenant*, or *Sinai Covenant*, was made between *God* and the *Iſraelites* by the Hand of *Moſes* [l]. It was in itſelf a *temporal* Covenant, containing only *temporal* Promiſes: But in its retired, myſtical meaning, it figured out the *Spiritual* Covenant before made, and was a *Shadow* of good Things to come [m]. That *external* Covenant (repreſenting as thro' a Glaſs darkly the *internal*) was often *renewed* with the People of the *Hebrews*: As in the Time of *Joſhua* at *Sichem* [n], and in the Reigns of *Aſa* [o], and of *Ahab* [p], and of *Joaſh* [q], *Hezekiah* [r], and *Joſiah* [s]. This I note to obviate a common Miſtake, as if becauſe a Covenant has been once *granted* and *fixed* on God's Part, it may not be properly ſaid to be *regranted*, or *renewed* with a fleeting Body of Men, as new Generations come up. Indeed it ſeems highly expedient, that ſuch Covenants ſhould be *renewed* frequently, becauſe the Men coming up in Succeſſion are *new*, tho' God is always the *ſame*; and it is proper that the contracting Parties ſhould make it their own Act and

CHAP. XI.

[i] *Exod.* VI. 4 — 7. IV. 28. *Eccluſ.* XLV. 7. 15.

[k] *Numb.* XXV. 12, 13. Here the Covenant was *conditional* (as appears by the *Forfeiture* of the Prieſthood afterwards) and *accepting* the Prieſthood, was accepting the *Conditions*: Therefore in this Inſtance, the Engagement was *reciprocal*, amounting to a *formal* Covenant.

[l] *Exod.* XIX. 3. XXIV. 8. *Deut.* V. 5. *Gal.* III. 19.

[m] *Heb.* VIII. 5. X. 1.

[n] *Joſhua* XXIV. 14 —— 25.

[o] 2 *Chron.* XV. 12, &c.

[p] 1 *Kings* XVIII. 39.

[q] 2 *Chron.* XXIII. 16, &c.

[r] 2 *Chron.* XXIX. 10.

[s] 2 *Chron.* XXXIV. 31, 32. 2 *Kings* XXIII. 3.

Deed.

CHAP. XI.

Deed. The Stipulations, which I have now been ſpeaking of, were between God and his his People *collectively* conſidered. But beſides theſe, there were alſo ſtanding Forms of covenanting between *God* and *particular* Perſons. Such were *Sacrifices* in general, and ſuch alſo were the *Sacraments* of the old *Law*, and more eſpecially *Circumciſion*, and the *Paſſover*, to which reſpectively the Chriſtian *Sacraments* ſucceeded.

THAT *Sacrifices* were *federal* Rites, is a Point generally allowed by the Learned, and which I need not here be at the Pains to prove [t]. What I ſhall more particularly inſiſt on, ſhall be the Jewiſh *Sacraments* previous to ours, the two moſt eminent, juſt before named.

I BEGIN with *Circumciſion*; which was manifeſtly a *federal* Rite, a formal Stipulation between God and Man; carrying in it mutual Engagements of Bleſſings on one Hand, and Service on the other. It is ſaid of Circumciſion, *This is my Covenant, &c.* And *it ſhall be a Token of the Covenant*; and a little after, *my Covenant ſhall be in your Fleſh for an everlaſting Covenant*; and the *uncircumciſed* ſhall be cut off, as having *broken my Covenant* [v]. All which imply that it was a *Covenanting* Rite, a Contract, or Stipulation paſſed between two Parties, namely between *God* and *Man*. But for the clearer apprehending of this Matter, we may conſider

[t] See *Mede* Opp. p. 370. *Dodwell*, One Altar, &c. c. VII. p. 145, &c. 163, &c. Abp. *Potter* on Church Government, p. 266. *Spencer* de Leg. Hebr. Tom. II. p. 766. Edit. Cant.

[v] *Gen.* XVII. 9 —— 14.

in

in *Circumciſion*, as in every other *Sacrament*, a *Sign*, and a *Thing ſignified*, or *Both together* as one Tranſaction. If the Name be applied to the bare *Sign*, then Circumciſion is not a Stipulation, but the *Token* of it; and if it be applied to the *Thing ſignified*, it means the *Terms* of Agreement: But if it be applied to the whole Tranſaction between both Parties, then it is formally the *Contract*, or *Stipulation* entred into here, and there. So that according to different Views, the Word *Circumciſion* may either ſtand for the *Sign*, *Token*, *Seal* of the Contract, or for the *Contract* itſelf, paſſing under thoſe Forms. This Obſervation will be of uſe hereafter, for the clearer Apprehenſion of the two Chriſtian Sacraments; which in like manner are either *Signs* and *Seals* of a Covenant, or the very *Acts of Covenanting*, according as you underſtand the Word *Sacrament*, in a ſtricter or larger Senſe. But I paſs on. That *Circumciſion* carried in it a Bond of Obligation on Man's Part, is very plain, ſince it made a Man a *Debtor to the whole Law* [w]. And that it likewiſe carried in it a correſpondent Engagement on God's Part, is as plain from God's Promiſes made at the Inſtitution of it [x], and from its being ſtyled a *Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith* [y]: That is to ſay, a kind of Inſtrument, by which God *ſealed*, or aſſured to the Parties his *Ac-*

CHAP. XI.

[w] *Gal.* V. 3. *Timothy*'s Caſe was ſingular, founded on particular Circumſtances, and can be no Impeachment of the *general* Maxim.

[x] *Gen.* XVII. 7. [y] *Rom.* IV. 11.

ceptance

CHAP. XI.

ceptance of ſuch Righteouſneſs, as *Abraham* was accepted in; and ſuch as was *ſignified* under that outward Rite, ſtyled in Scripture the *Circumciſion* of *the Heart* [z]. But it would be tedious to dwell longer upon a bye Point, and one ſo often diſcuſſed by knowing and judicious Divines [a].

THE other *ordinary* Sacrament of the Jewiſh Church was the *Paſſover*. That it was a *federal* Rite, may be ſtrongly argued from ſeveral Topics, which I ſhall barely touch upon in paſſing. 1. From its being a proper *Sacrifice*; a Point now concluded among the *Learned* [b], and ſcarce admitting of any further Diſpute. 2. From its *typical* and *myſterious* Nature, pointing to *Chriſt* and his *Sufferings*, and the *Fruits* thereof, in many obſervable Circumſtances [c], too long to mention in this Place. 3. From the Caſe of the other Jewiſh Sacra-

[z] *Rom.* II. 29. Compare *Deut.* X. 16. XXX. 6. *Jerem.* IV. 4.

[a] *Bucer*, Script. Anglican. p. 608, &c.
Buddeus, Miſcellan. Sacr. Tom. III. p. 8, &c.
Witſius, Oecon. Fœd. p. 700, &c.
Towerſon on the Sacraments, Part IV. p 47, &c.
Hoornbeeck, Socin. Conf. Tom. III. L. iii. p. 231, &c.

[b] *Cudworth* on the Lord's Supper Ch. II.
Bochart, Hierozoic. Tom. II. p. 573.
Hottinger in Notis ad *Tho. Goodwin*, p. 535.
Outram de Sacrificiis, Lib. I. c. 13. p. 146, 147.
Reland, Antiq. Vet. Heb. par. 3. p. 378.
Bp. *Patrick* in Exod. XII. 27.
Clericus in Num. IX. 7.
Vitringa, Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. I. p. 295.
Deylingius, Obſ. Sacr. Tom. III. p. 332. Tom. I. p. 287.
Moſhemius, Not. ad *Cudworth*, p. 18, 19.

[c] *Witſius*, Oeconom. Fœderum, p. 722 —— 730.
Vitringa, Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. I. L. iii. c. 9. p. 415, &c.

ments,

ments, *extraordinary*, ſuch as the *Manna*, and the *Rock*, &c. which remitted Men to *Chriſt*, and were a kind of *ſpiritual* Food[d] to as many as were *worthy*; importing a *federal* Relation to Almighty God, and a Communion with Him. 4. From expreſs Texts, intimating that the *Paſſover* was intended as a *Sign*, and a *Token*, and a *Memorial*, to keep up a conſtant Senſe of and Regard for the *Law of the Lord*[e], and for that *Deliverance*, by which God *confirmed* unto Himſelf that People to be *his People for ever*[f]. So that in that Service were implied the People's engaging to *keep the Law of God*, and God's engaging to be *their God*, while they did ſo; which two Things taken together make up the formal Notion of a *Contract*, or *Covenant*.

CHAP. XI.

FROM the *Jewiſh* Sacraments we may paſs on to the *Chriſtian* Sacraments, analogous to them, but exceeding them in ſeveral Reſpects, as being *leſs burthenſome*, and of *clearer* Signification, and Application, and made eſſential Parts of an higher and more excellent Inſtitution. Method requires, that I ſhould firſt ſay ſomething of Baptiſm, the initiating Sacrament, by which a Man ordinarily firſt enters into *Covenant* with God, becoming a *Chriſtian*[g]. That

[d] 1 *Cor.* X. 1, 2, 3, 4. See above, p. 197.

[e] *Exod.* XIII. 9, 16. See *Pelling* on the Lord's Supper, p. 63, 91, 112, 253.

[f] 2 *Sam.* VII. 24.

[g] Some have been willing to ſuppoſe, that if a Man embraces Chriſtianity, and fulfils the Terms, viz. *Faith* and *Repentance*, He is *ipſo facto* entred into *Covenant*, without any formal *Stipulation*.

CHAP. XI.

That Baptiſm is a *federal* Rite, a formal *Stipulation* between God and the Party baptized, might be probably argued many ways[h]. But for brevity ſake, I ſhall confine myſelf to the Conſideration of one expreſs Text; which I render thus: *The like Figure whereunto Baptiſm doth now ſave us; not the putting away the Filth of the Fleſh, but the* Stipulation [ἐπερώτημα] *of a good Conſcience to Godward, by the Reſurrection of Chriſt*[i]. Here we have the very Doctrine, which I am pleading for, that Baptiſm is a *federal* Rite, a *Stipulation* with God. So *Beza*, and *Grotius*, and other Critics of beſt Note[k] interpret the Place, and give very ſubſtantial Reaſons for it, which I need not here recite. I ſhall only add, that the Ancients conſtantly taught, that Baptiſm was a *Covenanting* Rite, a ſolemn Form of *ſtipulating* with God[l], the

But Scripture is plain: *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* Mark XVI. 15. And, *Except* one *be born of Water*, &c. *he cannot enter into the Kingdom of* God. *John* III. 5. The *Stipulation* is as neceſſary as the reſt: Or, not to diſpute about *Words*, it is at leaſt part of the *Terms* of Acceptance, and of true *Chriſtian Obedience*, and ſo of Evangelical *Repentance*; which, according to its full Notion, is but another Name for Evangelical *Obedience*. So that it is in vain to ſpeak of Chriſtian *Repentance*, or *Obedience* as entire, without taking in Conformity to the *Sacraments*, which is implied in the other, as a *part* is included in the whole. Comp. Archbiſhop *Potter* on Ch. Gov. p. 16, 17.

[h] Vid. *Dodwell*, Cyprian. Diſſertat XIII. Sect. 42. p. 442, &c. *Voſſius* de Baptiſm. Diſp IV. Theſ. 3. p. 269.

[i] 1 *Pet.* III. 21.

[k] They are moſt of them numbered by *Wolfius* upon the Text, who cloſes in with them.

[l] *Tertullian* ſtyles it *Obſignatio Fidei*. De Penitent. cap. VI. *Teſtatio Fidei, Sponſio Salutis*. De Bapt. cap. VI. *Anima non Lavatione, ſed Reſponſione ſancitur*. De Reſur. Carn. cap. XLVIII. *Fidei Pactio*. De

the *Seal* of the Lord[m]; and that it ſucceeded in the room of *Circumciſion*, being therefore called the *Chriſtian* Circumciſion, *made without Hands*[n], or the *Spiritual* Circumciſion[o], as a Figure and Inſtrument of it. CHAP. XI.

HAVING thus far cleared the way, we may now proceed to the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, the laſt of the four. And ſince it appears that the three former Sacraments were *federal* Rites, that ſingle Conſideration affords us a *preſumptive* Argument, that this is ſo likewiſe. But there are ſeveral other Conſiderations, that more directly prove it; and theſe are what I am going to lay down in their order.

1. THAT the Euchariſtical Service is a *federal* Service, follows directly from what has been before proved, that it imports and implies a real and vital *Communion* between God and every worthy Receiver. For, what can *Communion*, in this Caſe, import leſs than *Covenanting?* The leaſt that it implies, is a *reciprocal* Intercourſe of *Bleſſings* on one hand, and *Homage* on the other; which, in effect, is the ſame Thing with mutual *Stipulations*[p]. If it be

De Pudic. cap. IX. Conf. *Baſil.* de Spir. Sancto, cap. XII. p. 24. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. XL. p. 641. *Pſeudo-Dionyſ. Areop.* cap. III. *Facund.* Lib. IV. p. 62. Compare *Bingham*, XI. 7. 6.

[m] See *Bingham*, XI. 1. 6.

[n] *Coloſſ.* II. 11, 12. *Baſil. Homil.* in Baptiſm. p. 115. Tom. II. *Chryſoſt.* in Gen. Hom. 40. p. --- *Cyrill. Alexandr.* in Johann. Lib. IV. cap. 7. p. 432.

[o] Vid. *Juſtin. Mart.* Dial. pag. 222. *Cyprian.* Epiſt. LXIV. pag. 161.

[p] See *Johnſon's* Unbloody Sacrifice, Part II. p. 27, 103, 104, 105.

CHAP. XI.

ſaid, that it is only performing or executing, on both Sides, what was before ſtipulated in Baptiſm, it is obvious to reply, that ſuch Performances, on both Sides, carry in them the ſtrongeſt *Aſſurances* of a continuation of the ſame, and ſo amount, in juſt Conſtruction, to a *Repetition*, or *Renewal* of the reciprocal Engagements.

2. THE federal Nature of the Euchariſt may be farther argued from what learned Men have ſhewn of the Cuſtoms of divers Nations in *drinking* either *Blood*, or *Wine* inſtead of Blood, for the ratifying of *Covenants*[q]. Such kind of drinking was a noted *federal* Rite long before the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt: a conſideration, which taken alone, affords a ſtrong preſumptive Argument of the *federal* nature of this Sacrament, but if taken together with our Lord's own Comment upon it, in the Words, *Drink ye all of this, for this is the new Covenant*, &c. can leave but little room for any reaſonable diſpute about it.

3. But we may argue, ſtill more directly, from our Lord's own Words, *This* Cup, or Wine, *is my Blood of the New Covenant*[r], and *this is the new Covenant in my Blood*[s]. I render διαθήκη *Covenant*, rather than *Teſtament*, becauſe ſuch appears to be the conſtant Senſe of it in

[q] *Grotius* in Matt. XXVI. 26, 27. *Spencer* de Leg. Hebr. p. 614. Edit. Cant. *Zornius* Bibliothec. Antiquaria Exeg. p. 615.

[r] *Matt.* XXVI. 28. *Mark* XIV. 24.

[s] *Luke* XXII. 19. 1 *Cor.* XI. 25.

the

the *Septuagint*[t], as alſo in the *New Teſtament*, excepting perhaps one Place of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*[v]. Indeed, either the Name *Teſtament*, or the Name of *Covenant* is applicable to the ſame Thing conſidered under different Views; as the new Covenant is of a mixed or middle kind, in ſome reſpects *federal*, and in ſome *Teſtamentary*, and, as it were, a *Compound* of Both: For which Reaſon, it has been indifferently and promiſcuouſly called either a *Federal Teſtament*, or a *Teſtamentary Covenant*, to intimate its compound Nature[w]. But I take the *federal* Notion of it to be the primary or principal Part of the Idea, and to ſuit beſt with the then prevailing Senſe of the Word διαθήκη[x].

CHAP. XI.

OUR Lord's Expreſſions in the Inſtitution are plainly *federal* Expreſſions; as will appear

[t] Notandum quod *Brith*, verbum Hebraicum, *Aquila* συνθήκαλω, id eſt, *Pactum*, interpretatur: LXX ſemper διαθήκαλω, id eſt, *Teſtamentum*. Et in pleriſque Scripturarum locis *Teſtamentum* non *voluntatem defunctorum* ſonare, ſed *Pactum viventium*. Hieron. in Mal. c. II. 1816. Conf. *Salmaſ.* de Tranſubſtant. p. 541.

[v] Heb. IX. 16, 17. Vid. *Wolfius* Crit. Cur. in Loc. *Towerſon* on the Sacraments, Part I. p. 14, &c.

Aquila, *Symmachus*, *Theodotio* paſſim συνθήκη, Pactum, Fœdus. LXX. ſæpius διαθήκη, Teſtamentum. *Montfauc.* Lexic. ad Hexapl.

[w] Noſtrum Fœdus cum Deo non purum aut ſimplex quoddam Fœdus eſt, ſed habens quiddam mixtum ex *Fœdere* & *Teſtamento*. Chriſtus in manu habet id, de quo pactus eſt cum hominibus Deus, æternam nimirum hæreditatem: Quoniam autem Hic non niſi *moriendo* nobis illud Jus acquirit, idcirco quod ad Chriſtum ipſum attinet, *pactum* iſtud inter Deum & Homines initum, ſpeciem quandam *Teſtamenti* refert, quaſi ipſe *moriens* æterni Regni nos fecerit Hæredes. *Zornius* Opuſc. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 239.

See *Twells*'s Examination of new Text and Verſion, Part II. p. 64.

[x] Vid. *Zornius* Opuſc. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 238.

CHAP. XI. by comparing them with other the like Expreſſions made uſe of in the Old Teſtament in *federal* Solemnities[y]. When God inſtituted the *federal* Rite of *Circumciſion*, He ſaid; *This is my Covenant, which ye ſhall keep* [z], *&c.* Therefore, as ſure as Circumciſion was a *federal* Rite of the Jewiſh Church, ſo ſure is it that the Euchariſt is a *federal* Solemnity among Chriſtians. When God ſtruck up a *Covenant* with the People of the *Hebrews*, by the ſprinkling of Blood, the Form ran, *Behold the Blood of the Covenant which the Lord hath made* [a], *&c.* As much as to ſay, "Look upon yourſelves as "obliged by theſe federal Solemnities, to ob- "ſerve all the Commands which I have here "delivered." Accordingly, it is obſervable, that the People there inſtantly promiſed and engaged *to do all that the Lord had ſaid, and to be obedient* [b]: Which was expreſſing their formal conſent, and executing, as it were, their Counterpart in the Stipulation[c]. Now as our Bleſſed Lord, in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, addreſſed Himſelf to *Jews*, who had been accuſtomed to ſuch *federal* Phraſes, it is high-

[y] *Exod.* XXIV. 8. *Gen.* XVII. 10. See Nature and Obligation of Chriſtian Sacraments, p. 66, 85, &c.

[z] Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσεσθε. Gen. XVII. 10.

[a] Ἰδὲ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς διέθετο κύριος, &c. Exod. XXIV. 8. Vid. *Patrick* in loc. & *Bucherus*, Ant. Evang. ad Matth. XXVI. 28. p. 386, 389.

[b] *Exod.* XXIV. 3, 7. Comp. *Deut.* V. 27.

[c] Other like Inſtances of expreſs conſent on Man's Part, may be ſeen in *Gen.* XXVIII 20, &c. *Exod.* XIX. 8. *Joſh.* XXIV. 21. 24, 25. 2 *Chron.* XV. 14, 15. XXIII. 16 XXIX. 10. XXXIV. 31. *Ezr.* X. 3. *Nehem.* IX. 38, X. 28, 29, 39.

ly

ly reaſonable to believe, that He intended the Phraſes in ſuch a Senſe as They would be apt to take them in, namely, in a *federal* Senſe. CHAP. XI.

Socinus, to elude this Argument, pretends [d], that our Lord's Words in that Caſe may mean only, that this Sacramental Cup, or Wine, is a *Memorial* or *Commemoration* of the *Blood* once ſhed, and of the *Covenant* therein founded, or thereby executed. But if we have hitherto gone upon ſure Grounds, it will be eaſy to throw off thoſe laboured Subtilties. For, ſince it is manifeſt from the expreſs Doctrine of the Apoſtle, that the Euchariſt is not barely a *Memorial* but a *Communion* alſo of the *Blood*, and of what goes along with it; it will undeniably follow, that the ſame Euchariſt is not merely a *Memorial* of the *Covenant*, going along with the Blood, but a *Communion* alſo, or *Participation* of it, on Man's Side: And if there be a

[d] Hinc apparet, cum ipſum poculum *novum Teſtamentum* eſſe *in ſuo Sanguine* Chriſtus dixiſſe legitur, aliud nihil intelligendum eſſe, quam vini, ex illo poculo, potu, *Novi Teſtamenti* quod nobiſcum ſuo ſanguine interveniente pepigit (ſeu potius *ſui Sanguinis*, qui ad N. Teſtamentum confirmandum fuſus fuit) *Commemorationem* fieri. —— Ipſi bibentes, Novum Teſtamentum *prædicant* & *commemorant*; idque ſecum pactum fuiſſe, aliis *teſtantur* ac *ſignificant*, —— Sicque ſibi perſuaſum eſſe indicant. *Socin.* de uſu & fine Cœnæ Domini, p. 36. alias 759. Opp. Tom. I. Conf. *Catech. Racov.* Sect. VI. c. 4. p. 239. *Slichting* in 1 *Cor.* XI. 25.

Crellius's Account is not much different, in making it to be a kind of *Declaration* or *Teſtification* of our partaking of, or pertaining to the new Covenant [Teſtamentum vero, ſive *Fœdus novum* ideo appellatur, quia ſit ſolennis Ritus, quo omnes Chriſtiani in perpetuum profiteri debeant, ſe ad *novum fœdus* pertinere. *Crellii* Ethic. p. 352. conf. 353.] This is juſt ſuch another Evaſion, as the interpreting *Communion* by a *Declaration* of Communion, and admits of the like Anſwer. See above, p. 280, &c.

CHAP. XI.

Participation on one Side, there muſt be alſo a *Communication* on the other Side; and ſo both Parts are compleat. God readmits us into Covenant, and we reaccept, under this appointed Form, under this Holy Solemnity; and thus the mutual League of Amity is reeſtabliſhed, the compact renewed and confirmed. Every worthy Receiver, as often as He *Symbolically* receives the *Blood*, revives and recruits his Intereſt in our Lord's *Paſſion*, and in the *Covenant* thereupon founded: He takes new Hold of it, and binds Himſelf over to it by more and ſtronger Ties; which is what we mean by *renewing* the Baptiſmal Covenant in this other Sacrament of the Holy Euchariſt. How inſignificant, unedifying, and comfortleſs, in compariſon, is a bare *Commemoration!* It neither anſwers the *Force* of our Lord's Words, farther interpreted by St. *Paul*, nor the Purpoſes of *Holineſs*, nor the Nature, Ends, or Uſes of the *Spiritual* Life, nor God's uſual *Methods* of dealing with his Church and People in all former Ages.

4. THE *federal* Nature of the Euchariſt may be farther confirmed from the very obſervable *Analogy*, which St. *Paul* takes notice of and illuſtrates [e], between the *Sacrament* of the Holy Communion, and the *Sacrifices* of the Jews and Gentiles. *They* were of a *federal* Nature, by the Apoſtle's Account of them; and ſo muſt *this* be alſo, if it was in that very View that He form'd the Compariſon, or Par-

[e] 1 *Cor.* X. 16.

allel,

allel. I beg leave here to uſe the Words of a very judicious and learned Prelate of our Church, who ſays: "In the antient *Sacrifices*, "both among *Jews* and *Heathens*, one Part of "the *Victim* was offered upon the *Altar*, and "another reſerved to be eaten of thoſe Perſons, "in whoſe Name the *Sacrifice* was made: This "was accounted a ſort of partaking of *God*'s "*Table*, and was a *federal* Rite, whereby He "owned his *Gueſts* to be in his *Favour* and un-"der his *Protection*, as they by offering Sacri-"fices *acknowledged* Him to be *their God* [f] — "The Lord's Supper was always believed to "*ſucceed* in the Place of *Sacrifices* [g]. — Eating "the Lord's Supper was the ſame Rite in the "*Chriſtian* Church with eating the Things of-"fered in *Sacrifice* among the Jews and Hea-"thens. It is an Act of *Communion* or *Fellow-"ſhip* with God, at whoſe Table we are ſaid "to be entertained; and therefore it is de-"clared to be inconſiſtent with *eating* the Gen-"tile Sacrifices, which is an Act of Commu-"nion with Devils, to whom theſe Sacrifices "were offered [h]." From theſe plain and unde-niable Principles it directly follows, that the Euchariſt is, at the loweſt, a *federal Rite*: I ſay, at the loweſt, becauſe more than that has been proved, as I conceive, in a former Chapter, which treats of 1 *Cor.* X. 16.

CHAP. XI.

A LATE Divine of our Church, in a little Piece of his upon this Subject, has a *Diſtin-*

[f] Abp. *Potter* on Church Government, p. 266.
[g] Ibid. p. 265. [h] Ibid. p. 269, 270.

ction

CHAP. XI.

ction worth the examining, which I ſhall here give the Reader in his own Words: "The "Lord's Supper is not properly *the federal Rite*, "or *the Covenant Rite*, but the *Memorial* of it: "The Death of Chriſt was *the federal Rite*, "and the Lord's Supper is the *Memorial* of "Chriſt's Death. But tho' the Lord's Supper "is neither a *proper* Sacrifice, nor the *great*, "*original*, or *primitive* federal Rite, ſtrictly "ſpeaking; yet being a *Feaſt upon a Sacrifice* "(or in *Commemoration* of that great Sacrifice of "the Death of Chriſt, which was the *true* and "*proper* federal or Covenant Rite) it may be "ſtyled a *federal* Rite, in the ſame Senſe, in "which the *Jews* eating of their Sacrifices "was or might be eſteemed to be ſuch a Rite, "*viz.* an open Profeſſion of their being in *Co-*"*venant* with God, and having devoted them-"ſelves to his Service as his peculiar People[i]." I ſaid, this *Diſtinction* was worth the examining. I judge it not *accurate*, nor indeed *right* upon the whole: But it appears to be well aimed; and it points out to us ſome Difficulties, which ſeem to want a clearer Solution. The *Diſtinction* would have anſwered better, had it been made to run between *Covenant* and *Covenant* (than between federal Rites, *proper*, and *improper*) or between Covenant conſidered *at large* and *particular* Stipulations. If the Death of Chriſt is properly a *federal Rite* at all, it is with reſpect to the Covenant made between God the Father and Chriſt Jeſus, in behalf of

[i] *Mapletoft*'s Plain Account of the Lord's Supper, p. 138.

Mankind

Mankind *collectively* conſidered, and not with reſpect to the ſeveral *Stipulations* coming after, and made between God and particular Men. The Euchariſt may as *properly* be ſaid to be a *federal* Rite with regard to theſe particular Stipulations, as the Death of Chriſt can be ſuppoſed to be with regard to the *New Covenant* at large. But I much queſtion, whether the *Death of Chriſt* ought to be called a *federal Rite* at all; which appears to be too low and too diminutive a Name for it: Eſpecially conſidering the ill uſe which the *Socinians* have been apt to make of it. The Death of Chriſt is really the *Price* of our *Redemption*, the *valuable Conſideration*, whereupon the Covenant was founded, and in which it ſtands. It was ſubmitted to, once for all, and is never to be repeated; which ſufficiently diſtinguiſhes it from whatever has hitherto paſſed under the Name of a *federal Rite*, and ſhews it to be a Thing of much higher Conſideration. Therefore, let not the Name of *federal Rite* be ſo *improperly* applied to what was no *Rite* at all, nor can ever come under the common or proper Notion of a religious or federal *Rite*. But the Sacrifices and Sacraments of the Jewiſh Church were properly *federal Rites:* And ſince the Chriſtian Sacraments are allowed to be federal Rites in as *proper* a Senſe as thoſe were, that is ſufficient to our Purpoſe. They were ceremonious Obſervances, made uſe of in *Stipulations* between God and Man; and ſo are theſe: Not *eſſential* to the Stipulation *neceſſitate medii*, but *neceſſitate*

CHAP. XI.

CHAP. XI.

tate præcepti; not in themſelves, but as *required*, and made neceſſary to us by free and voluntary Appointment. However, they are more than an *open Profeſſion* of our being in *Covenant* with God: They are *Covenanting* Rites, or *ſtipulating* Acts, by which our Stipulation with God either *commences* (as in Baptiſm) or is *renewed*, as in the other Sacrament, which we are now upon.

THE Author laſt cited allows the Euchariſt to be a *Feaſt upon a Sacrifice*, and ſo of conſequence a *federal Feaſt*. This is a Notion, which may deſerve a more particular Conſideration in this Place; and the rather becauſe it was very plauſibly advanced by an eminent Divine of our Church near 100 Years ago [k], and long paſſed current among Divines and Critics of the firſt Rank, both here and abroad, but has been lately diſputed by ſeveral learned Hands, with great Acuteneſs, tho' perhaps not with equal Solidity. It may be a Piece of Juſtice due to a great Man, and to an important Cauſe, to examine fairly, but as briefly alſo as may be, the Strength of what has been objected to a prevailing Notion, which for ſome time appeared and ſtill appears to carry in it the Features of Truth. The Notion, in ſhort, is this; that the Euchariſt, conſidered in its ſpiritual and myſtical View, is a *Feaſt upon a Sacrifice* (*viz.* the Sacrifice once offered upon the Croſs) bearing ſome *Analogy* to the

[k] Dr. *Cudworth*, True Notion of the Lord's Supper A. D. 1642. firſt Edit.

Jewiſh

Jewiſh *Sacrificial Feaſts*, which were Figures or Shadows of this true Spiritual Feeding. For as thoſe were Banquets upon *typical* Sacrifices, this is a Banquet upon the *real* Sacrifice, to which they pointed: And as thoſe Banquets were *federal* directly, with reſpect to the *Legal* Covenant; ſo is this Banquet *federal* with reſpect to the *Evangelical* Covenant, formerly couched under the Legal one. This, I think, is the Sum and Subſtance of Dr. *Cudworth*'s *True Notion of the Lord's Supper*. Next let us examine what has been objected to it. CHAP. XI.

THE firſt conſiderable Author that appeared againſt it, was a learned Divine of our own[l], who had an *Hypotheſis* to ſerve, of which I ſhall ſay nothing here, reſerving it for the next Chapter, where it ſhall be examined at large. Moſt of his Objections againſt Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion belong to that Hypotheſis of a *material* Sacrifice, and therefore may here be paſſed over. I ſhall only take notice of one Thing objected, namely, that neither Prieſts nor People ever feaſted on any Sacrifices, which *They* had not *offered before*; therefore Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion ſuits not with the ancient *Sacrificial Feaſts*[m]. But it is eaſy to reply, that one diſagreeing Circumſtance, found among many reſembling ones, is not ſufficient to overturn the *Analogy*: Beſides, in this very Caſe, the *Chriſtian Feaſt*, or *Feaſtings* upon what was *offered*

[l] *Hickes*'s Chriſtian Prieſthood, p. 165. I uſe the Third Edition of 1711.

[m] *Hickes*, ibid. p. 170.

by

CHAP. XI.

by the *true* High Prieſt Chriſt Jeſus, very fitly anſwer, in the Analogy, to the Jewiſh Feaſtings upon what had been offered by their *typical* Prieſts, or High Prieſt: So that I ſee no force at all in the Objection.

ANOTHER learned Writer, ſome Years after, expreſſed his diſlike of Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion, and argued againſt it as far as either Wit or Learning could ſupply: I ſhall here conſider his Objections.

1. HE intimates, as if it were abſurd that Chriſtians *ſhould feaſt upon ſomething that is a Sacrifice, and not offered*[n]. But were not Chriſt's Body and Blood *offered?* That is the *Sacrifice* which Chriſtians feaſt upon in the Euchariſt, according to Dr. *Cudworth:* They feaſt upon the *Paſſion.*

2. IT is further pleaded, that Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion ſeems *much of a Piece with that Conceit of the Calviniſts, that we receive the natural Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, tho' as far diſtant from us as Heaven is from the Earth*[o]. But that *Conceit*, as it is called, is a very ſober Truth, if underſtood of *receiving* the natural Body into *cloſer* myſtical *Union*, as explained in a preceding Chapter. However, Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion of a *Banquet* relates not to the Body conſidered as *glorified*, but to the Body conſidered as *crucified*, in which reſpect only it is *eaten*; ſo that this Objection may be looked upon as *foreign.*

[n] *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 338. alias 344.
[o] *Johnſon*, ibid.

3. IT

CHAP. XI.

3. IT is farther objected by the ſame learned Author, that *upon this Suppoſition our Saviour made a Feaſt upon the Sacrifice, before the Sacrifice had been offered*[p]. And why might He not, eſpecially when the Time was ſo near approaching, and the Sacrifice juſt going to be offered, that it might well be *conſidered* as a Thing done? This Objection however affects only the firſt and *original* Euchariſt, not the ſucceeding ones: And the like Objection might be as juſtly urged againſt the *Original Paſſover*, as differing in its Nature and Notion from the Paſſovers that ſucceeded. It might be pleaded, for Inſtance, that the Paſchal Feaſt was no *Memorial*, no *Paſſover*, becauſe the *firſt* Paſſover (which was the *Pattern* for the following ones) was *previous*[q] to the great Tranſaction *commemorated* in it, *previous* to the *paſſing over* the Dwellings of the *Hebrews*. But ſuch kind of arguing in that Sacrament, would be juſtly rejected as *frivolous*, or *captious*, ſince there was no more difference between the *original* Paſſover and the *later* ones, than the neceſſary difference of Circumſtances required. Such is the Caſe alſo with reſpect to the *original* Euchariſt, and the *later* Euchariſts: The ſame kind of *Prolepſis* will equally ſolve the difficulty, whether here, or there.

4. IT is objected, that it *cannot be ſaid that the Euchariſt is a Feaſt on a Sacrifice*, unleſs it be allowed either that the bare *Elements* are a

[p] *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part II Pref. p. 3.

[q] See *Exod.* XII. 21, &c.

CHAP. XI.

Sacrifice, or elſe that they are tranſubſtantiated into the *real* Body[r]. But a *Symbolical* or *Spiritual* Feaſt upon a Sacrifice (which is all that Dr. *Cudworth* maintains) may very well be ſuppoſed without either: The *Sacrificial Feaſt*, which we here plead for, is not a Feaſt of the *Mouth*, but of the *Mind*; not a Bodily Banquet, but a Banquet of the Soul, upon the *Fruits* of the Death of Chriſt.

5. IT is objected, that Chriſt's *crucified* Body, and Blood *ſhed*, are now no more, have *no Being*, as ſuch, and therefore there can be *no Feaſt upon them*; conſequently, it is but an *airy Notion* to imagine any ſuch *Feaſt*, or *Sacrifice*[s]. To which we may reply, that tho' the *crucified* Body, as ſuch, is not, and tho' the Blood *ſhed* is not, yet the *Fruits* remain, and ever will remain as a *Feaſt* for good Men here and hereafter: But as to *oral* Manducation either of the *natural* Body, or of the *Res Sacramenti* (whatever it is ſuppoſed to be) and as to a *material* Feaſt, and a material *Sacrifice* in the Euchariſt, thoſe indeed have been *favourite Notions* among many, but are not ſufficiently ſupported by *Scripture*, or *Antiquity*. I meet with nothing more, in the laſt learned Writer, againſt Dr. *Cudworth*'s Explication of the Lord's Supper. But I may note, by the way, that whereas it had been before objected, that the Notion was entirely *new* and *ſingular*, this learned Gentleman is ſo ingenuous as to own, *that the Ancients did ſometimes*

[r] *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part II. Pref. p. 4.
[s] *Johnſon*, ibid. p. 4.

ſpeak of receiving the Sacrament, as of a Banquet upon what had been firſt offered to God [t], and with ſome *Alluſion* alſo to the Feaſts upon the *Peace-Offerings* under the Law [v]. And I may add, that the antient Teſtimonies referred to, plainly ſhew, that thoſe *Ancients* ſpoke of a Banquet upon the *Things ſignified* (not upon the *Signs* only) and upon the *real* Sacrifice, not upon the bare *Memorial:* So that Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion accords well with thoſe Ancients. CHAP. XI.

FROM our own Divines I may next proceed to ſome learned Foreigners, of the *Lutheran* way, who have alſo, now lately, expreſſed ſome Diſſatisfaction with reſpect to Dr. *Cudworth*'s Hypotheſis: For, tho' they readily approve of his rejecting any *corporeal* or *material* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, yet finding that his Notion is not favourable to *local* Preſence, and *oral* Manducation, they alſo have ſhewn ſome Inclination to diſcredit it, or, if it might be, to confute it.

THE learned *Pfaffius* in the Year 1715, made ſome mention of Dr. *Cudworth*'s Hypotheſis; firſt, commending it as very *ingenious*, and next labouring to warp it to the *Lutheran* Notion of a *real* and *local* Preſence [w]. But at the ſame Time, He took notice of ſome *Objections* made to it (moſtly the ſame which I have above recited, and anſwered) and honoured them with

[t] *Johnſon*, Unbl. Sacr. Part I. p. 338. alias 344.
[v] *Johnſon*, ibid. p. 345.
[w] *Pfaffius*, Diſſertat. de obl. vet. Euchariſt. p. 199.

CHAP. XI. his own Approbation [x]. Beſides which, He thought alſo of a *new* Objection, which may here deſerve conſidering.

THE Objection is, that Chriſt was properly a *Sin Offering*, anſwering to the Levitical Sacrifices of that kind, which were never feaſted upon; therefore the Euchariſtical Banquet does not aptly correſpond to the *Sacrificial Feaſts*, which were appropriate to *Peace Offerings*, and belonged not to *Sin Offerings* [y]. But the Anſwer to this is very ſhort, and obvious: Chriſt our Lord was a *Sin Offering* and a *Peace Offering*, both in one; as is plainly taught by St. *Paul* [z]. And if the Sacrifice of Chriſt be conſidered in the Euchariſt, under its moſt comfortable, moſt endearing View, as a *Peace Offering* (not excluding the other Views) have we any Reaſon to object againſt ſo wiſe and ſo kind an Inſtitution? To repreſent the Sacrifice of Chriſt merely as a *Sin Offering*, would be repreſenting nothing but the melancholy and diſmal Part of it, which had not the *ſweet Odour*, the *ſweet ſmelling Savour* accompanying it. Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion of a *Sacrificial Feaſt* goes upon the more delightful view, as St. *Paul*'s alſo does in the Text before referred

[x] *Pfeffius* ibid. p. 170, 171. & in *Addendis*.

[y] Ne negari tamen poteſt, S. *Euchariſtiam* in eo ab *epulo Sacrificiali* differre, quod hoc ex Sacrificio *pro peccato* (cujus Sanguis in Sanctum Sanctorum inferri debuit, & *quale* Chriſtus fuit, 2 *Cor.* V. 21. *Hebr.* IX. 12.) non conficî, nec Sanguis unquam bibi potuit. *Levit.* VI. 30. *Deut.* VII. 27. *Pfaff.* p. 171.

[z] *Epheſ.* V. 1. Conf. *Wolfius* in loc. *Witſii* Miſcellan. Sacr. L. II. Diſſ 2 p. 511, 512. *Deylingii* Obſervat. Sacr. Tom. I. p. 315, 316. *Outram*, de Sacrif. p. 209 —— 214.

to:

to: Therefore there is no more room for objecting, in this reſpect, againſt our learned Author, than there is for objecting againſt the Bleſſed Apoſtle. But I paſs on. CHAP. XI.

THE excellent *Buddeus* (in a Diſſertation written in 1715, publiſhed in 1727) expreſſes Himſelf with great Caution and Tenderneſs concerning Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion of the Lord's Supper: And all the Fault he has to find with it, is, That it appears not favourable to the *Lutheran* Notion of the *real* Preſence, reſolving the Euchariſtical Supper (as He ſuppoſed) into *Signs* only and *Symbols* [a]. The Objection runs in Terms too *general* and *indefinite*: For *real Preſence* is a Phraſe of ſome Latitude, and capable of more Senſes than one. If a *real* Participation of the *Fruits* of Chriſt's Paſſion, together with a *real* ſtrengthening of the *myſtical* Union of our Bodies with Chriſt's *glorified* Body (however *diſtant*) may ſuffice, Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion will not be found defective ſo far: But if the deſign of the Objection be to plead for an *oral* Manducation of Chriſt's *natural* Body, or a *local* Preſence of it (crucified, or glorified) That ſtands upon no Authority of *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, but was condemned long ago by our Lord Himſelf, in his Anſwer to the *Capernaites* [b].

[a] Haud obſcurè eò tendit, ut ſolum pro *Signo* atque *Symbolo* quodam [Sacra Cœna] habeatur, quod cum præſentia *reali* Corporis ac Sanguinis Chriſti conſiſtere nequit. *Buddeus*, Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 69.

[b] *John* VI. 63.

CHAP. XI.

ANOTHER very learned and ingenious *Lutheran* has taken particular Pains to confute (if it were poſſible) Dr. *Cudworth*'s *True Notion*, in his *Notes* upon the *Latin* Verſion, and in his *Preface* to the ſame, printed *A. D.* 1733. His great concern is for the real and local Preſence: And He repreſents Dr. *Cudworth*, not only as making the Elements bare *Symbols* and *Figures*, which is true, but as making the *Lord's Supper* itſelf nothing more than a *Memorial* [c]; which is contrary to *Truth*, and *Fact*, and is a manifeſt Injury done to his very learned Author. For, how could Dr. *Cudworth* be ſuppoſed to make the Euchariſt a bare *Memorial*, when He profeſſedly contends for a *real* Spiritual Banquet, a *real* Feaſting upon all the *Benefits* of the grand Sacrifice? Is *partaking* of the Sacrifice nothing more than *commemorating*? Or, is the *Feaſt* ever the leſs *real*, for being *Spiritual* and *Heavenly*, and reaching both to *Soul* and *Body*; both to this World and the World to come? It is plain enough that Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion is no way favourable to the

[c] Non obſcurè hic vir doctiſſimus ſignificat, eorum ſeſe favere partibus, qui panem & vinum, quibus frui datur illis qui ad Sacram Cœnam accedunt, *Symbola* tantum & *Imagines* Corporis & Sanguinis Servatoris noſtri eſſe; ipſum verò hoc convivium ritum eſſe eo unice inſtitutum conſilio putant, ut *memoria* magni Sacrificii illius repetatur & renovetur, quod pro generis humani peccatis Chriſtus in cruce Supremo Numini intulit. *Moſheim.* in Notis, p. 10. confer. p. 11, 12.

Sapiunt hæc Scholam cœtus illius, qui ſemetipſum *Reformatum* dici vult; cui quidem S. Cœna nihil eſt, quam *Adumbratio* Beneficiorum morte & meritis Jeſu Chriſti humano generi partorum. —— *Reformati Signis* tantum & *Imaginibus* Sacrificii potiri ſuos opinantur in S. Cœna. *Moſheim.* in Præfat.

Figuriſts,

Figuriſts, or *Memorialiſts*, but much otherwiſe; yea more ſo by far, than the Notion or Notions which are ſet up againſt it. For the certain Truth is (and why ſhould it be any longer diſſembled?) that none give ſo great Advantage to the *Figuriſts*, as Thoſe that contend for *oral* Manducation, and make the Sacramental Feaſt *common* both to worthy and unworthy; and who, in order to bring that about, interpret the Words of the *Inſtitution*, as likewiſe 1 *Cor.* X. 16, *&c.* ſo as to exclude all Intimation of *Benefits*. Which is what the *Figuriſts* moſt of all wiſh for: And if that be once granted them, They deſire nothing farther to carry their Cauſe. CHAP. XI.

BUT that I may not ſeem to lay a Charge of this Nature without ſufficient grounds, let it but be conſidered how the laſt learned Objector [d] to Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion, labours to elude all Scripture Proof of *Benefits*, as drawn from 1 *Cor.* X. 16. only to make the Sacra-

[d] Hic monuiſſe ſatis erit, premi ab eo veſtigia præcipuorum *Reformati Cœtus Doctorum*, &c. —— velle enim eos notum eſt, ideo Cœnam a Servatore noſtro potiſſimum eſſe inſtitutam, ut *Sancti Homines*, qui ad eam accedunt, cum Chriſto & Servatore ſuo arctius conjungantur, & *Beneficiorum* Hominibus ab eo partorum reddantur *participes*: Nos vero repudiare, quia *omnes* Homines, ſive *probi* ſint ſive *improbi*, Corporis & Sanguinis Domini *verè fieri compotes* in S. Cœna ſtatuimus. Quæ quidem eorum Sententia haud patitur, ut verba Sancti Hominis aliter quam de *Spirituali conjunctione Fidelium* cum Chriſto accipiant. Mihi verò expoſitio Hæc neque verbis *Pauli*, neque propoſito ejus videtur eſſe conſentaneum —— *generatim* & *univerſe* tradit, S. Cœnam Communionem eſſe Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti; nec Chriſtianorum aliquem, ad Sacrum hoc Epulum venientium, *cujuſcunque demum ſit indolis*, ab hac communione excludit. *Moſhem.* in Notis, p. 30.

CHAP. XI.

mental Feeding common both to *good* and *bad* (as his Hypotheſis requires) and ſo at length to reſolve the Apoſtle's whole Senſe into this only, that all Communicants equally receive what the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of, and that the Text is not to be underſtood of any *Spiritual Union* of good Men, but of an *external* Profeſſion, or *outward* Membership[e]: Which, ſo far, is the very ſame Interpretation that the *Socinians* and other *Figuriſts* warmly contend for. It is true, He ſuppoſes the Lord's natural Body and Blood to be really or locally *preſent*, as well as really *received* (which the *Figuriſts* deny) but He ſuppoſes no Spiritual *Benefits* to be intimated in the Text, becauſe He ſuppoſes every Communicant to receive *all* that is there ſpoken of, tho' the *unworthy* can receive no *Benefits*. Thus the force of St. *Paul*'s Doctrine in that Place (ſo far as concerns Spiritual *Benefits*) is eluded and fruſtrated. And when thoſe prime Texts are thus explained away, what other Scripture Texts are there left ſufficient to found the Doctrine of *Spiritual Benefits* upon? I know, there is a diſtinction, by the help of which *good* Men may be *preſumed* to receive *Benefits*, and *bad* Men *detriment* from the ſame Things: But the Queſtion now is not whether good Men *may* receive Benefits, but whether theſe or any other Texts poſitively

[e] Cum in S. Cœna Chriſtiani compotes fiant Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, *teſtenturque*, quoties ſacrum illum cibum ſumunt, ſeſe inter ſe conjunctos & unius ſacræ civitatis membra eſſe. *Moſhem.* in Præfat.

teach

teach that they infallibly *do*. If the Words of *Inſtitution*, and thoſe of St. *Paul* in 1 *Cor.* X. do not teach it, I muſt frankly profeſs, that I know not what other Texts can be juſtly thought to do it without them. So that in the laſt reſult, for the ſake of I know not what *corporal* or *local Preſence*, and *oral* Manducation, the moſt important Article of all, which concerns *Spiritual Benefits*, is left to ſhift for itſelf, diveſted of *Scripture Proof*, and ſtanding only on *Tradition*, or the *Courteſy* of the common Adverſaries. The *Reformed* Churches (ſtrictly ſo called) have been often, and very invidiouſly charged upon this Head. But after all, They are the Men, who have formerly been, and ſtill are the true and faithful Supporters of the Doctrine of *Spiritual Benefits* in the Euchariſt [f]. They maintain it in a *rational*, *conſiſtent* way, and, as becomes them, upon a *Scripture Foot*; grounding that Doctrine, chiefly, on our Lord's Words in the *Inſtitution*, and upon the Words of St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* X. 16. If they who *participate* of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Senſe there *intended*, are really *ingraſted* into Chriſt, and are *vital* Members of Him, and *one* with Him, then indeed the Doctrine of Spiritual *Graces* or *Benefits* reſts upon firm Ground: But if Men may *participate* of the ſame, in the Senſe there ſpoken of, however *unworthy*, and in Heart and Life *alienated* from Chriſt, and without any Spiritual *Benefits* at all; then it

CHAP. XI.

[f] Compare *Werenfelſ.* Diſſertat. de Cœna Domini, c. 3. p. 352, &c. Alias p. 202, &c. Item 405. Alias 230.

CHAP. XI.

plainly follows, that the *Communion of Chriſt's Body* and *Blood* does not, in itſelf, imply any Benefits at all, neither do thoſe *Texts*, nor perhaps any other, teach any ſuch Doctrine; but the Doctrine muſt be left to ſtand, as it can, either upon bare *Preſumption*, or at moſt upon the *Tradition* of the Church. Let but any Man look into the learned Writings of *Chemnitius*, for Example, or *Gerhard*, to ſee how They prove the *beneficial* Nature of this Sacrament; and there it will be found, that all, in a manner, reſolves into this, that ſince Chriſt's Body and Blood is there given, all Spiritual Graces are by Implication therewith given. Right, if as many as receive the *Body* and *Blood* in St. *Paul*'s Senſe of *Communion*, receive alſo the *Graces*. But that They deny: For the *unworthy* Communicants are ſuppoſed to receive the Body, without the *Graces*. Therefore there is no certain Connection, in their way, between the *Body* and the *Graces:* Therefore the main Argument of all, on which the Doctrine of ſuch *Graces* depends, is defeated; and St. *Paul*'s meaning in 1 *Cor.* X. amounts only to a *Commemoration* of Chriſt's Death, or an *outward* Profeſſion of Chriſt's Religion, which indeed is what the learned *Moſheim* (as before noted) reſolves it into. From hence then let the indifferent Readers now judge, whether the learned *Cudworth*, or his learned Adverſary, moſt favours the *Memorialiſts*. One admits of *Benefits*, and can *prove* them by St. *Paul*'s Words, juſtly interpreted; the other admits them *verbally*

bally, but in effect deſtroys them, by deſtroying the prime ſtanding *Proofs*, upon which they reſt. CHAP. XI.

I THOUGHT it of ſome moment thus previouſly to remove a *Prejudice*, wrongfully thrown upon Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion in particular, and upon the *Reformed* Divines in general: And now I proceed to examine what his learned Antagoniſt has farther advanced in the way of *Argument*. He has not indeed produced any *new* Argument beyond what I have before mentioned, and anſwered; but He has pitched upon two of them, as moſt conſiderable, endeavouring to reinforce them in more pompous Form.

1. THE firſt is, that Chriſt had not yet *offered* Himſelf a *Sacrifice*, when He *inſtituted* the Euchariſt: Therefore the *original* Euchariſt was not a Feaſt *conſequent* upon a Sacrifice: Therefore the ſubſequent Euchariſts, being undoubtedly of the *ſame kind* with the *firſt*, are not Feaſts upon a Sacrifice [g]. I deſire the Reader to look back to the Anſwer before given to the ſame Objection, as propoſed by a learned Writer of our own [h]. All I ſhall here farther add, is, that many learned Writers ancient and modern (as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew in my next Chapter) have taught, that Chriſt did really *offer* Himſelf as a *Sacrifice*, *before* his Paſſion, and *in* his Paſſion, and *after*; and that thoſe three ſeveral Acts may be juſtly looked upon as *one continued Oblation*. If this Hypotheſis be admitted, the Edge of the Objection

[g] *Moſhem.* in Præfat. [h] See above, p. 447.

is

CHAP. XI. is blunted, or broken at once, without more adoe: Or, if it be rejected, yet the former Anſwer will ſtand in full Force.

2. THE Second Objection is, that the Sacrifice of Chriſt correſponds to the *Sin Offerings* of old (which had no *Feaſts* following) and not to the *Peace Offerings*, which had [i]. This was before objected by *Pfaffius*, and has been anſwered above [k]. But I may here add, that St. *Paul* Himſelf conceived that the Sacrifice of Chriſt correſponded, ſome way or other, to the *Peace Offerings*, as appears by the Parallel which He draws (1 *Cor.* X.) between the *Peace Offerings* of the Law, and the *Euchariſt* under the Goſpel. If St. *Paul*, notwithſtanding that He ſuppoſed the Euchariſt to be a Repreſentation, Memorial, and Communion of our Lord's *Paſſion*, yet conceived it *analogous* to the *Peace Offerings*, and to the *Feaſts* thereupon; then certainly Dr. *Cudworth* could not be much out of the way, in maintaining the ſame *Analogy*, or in conceiving that the two Notions of *Chriſt's Sacrifice*, and of a *Sacrificial Banquet*, are conſiſtent with each other, and agree well together. So that it is in vain to argue againſt Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion from ſuch Topicks as equally affect the *Apoſtle* Himſelf. I have before examined [l] this learned Gentleman's Account of St. *Paul*'s Reaſoning in that Chapter, and have ſhewn where it is defective: But be that as it will, it cannot be denied that the Apoſtle is there ſpeaking of the *Sacrificial Feaſts* among the

[i] *Moſhem.* ibid. [k] See above, p. 450. [l] Above, p. 308—315.

Jews,

Jews, and that He judged the Euchariſt to be a Feaſt of *like kind*, bearing ſuch Reſemblance to them, as was ſufficient to ſupport his Argument, and to make good his Parallel. So much in anſwer to the learned *Moſheim*, in behalf of our learned Countryman. CHAP. XI.

THERE is another very eminent *Lutheran*, who, as late as the Year 1736, has given his Judgment of Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion, in Terms of Reſpect, and with his own Approbation *, as to the main of the Notion; referring alſo to St. *Paul*, as affording ſufficient warrant for it.

MY Readers will, I hope, candidly excuſe the Excurſion here made, in order to do Juſtice to a very *great Man* in the firſt Place, and next, to the *Reformed* Divines in general, and at the ſame time to a very important Article of Religion, which concerns the Spiritual *Benefits* conferred in the Euchariſt. Upon the whole, I take leave to ſay, that the Objections raiſed againſt the Notion eſpouſed by Dr. *Cud-*

* A Sacrificio diſtingui ſolet *epulum Sacrificiale*, quale de *oblatis* olim & *Pagani* & *Iſraelitæ* inſtituere ſolebant. —— Et Hoc ipſum epulum *Sacrificium* interdum appellatur, &c. ——— Cum ejuſmodi epulo Sacrificiali S. Euchariſtia non incommode comparari poteſt. Præivit Apoſtolus 1 Cor. X. 14. et fuſius id demonſtravit *Cudworthus* in Libro de *vera notione Cœnæ Dominicæ*, Lond. 1642. & 1676. ——— Nos igitur intercedere nollemus, ſi Adverſarii [viz. *Pontificii*] hoc ſenſu S. Cœnam *Sacrificium*, aut *epulum de Sacrificio* dicere vellent. Nam Servator partem quaſi victimæ pro nobis oblatæ, videlicet Corpus & Sanguinem ſuum, in hoc epulo nobis comedendum & bibendum exhibet, cum inquit: *Edite, Hoc eſt Corpus meum, Bibite, Hic eſt Sanguis meus.* Sed Pontificii non *Epulum de Sacrificio*, ſed Sacrificium *verum*, & *propriè* dictum, eſſe contendunt. *Deyling*. Obſerv. Miſcellan. p. 294.

worth,

CHAP. XI.

worth, appear to be rather ingenious than ſolid, rather induſtriouſly ſought, upon foreign Conſiderations, than naturally ariſing from the Subject-matter, and proving at length, not that there is any Thing faulty in his Notion, but that there are Faults in thoſe other Schemes, which ſtand in oppoſition to it, or comport not with it. The favourable Reception which the Notion had met with amongſt our own Divines all along, till very lately, and alſo among very conſiderable Divines abroad (both *Lutheran* and *Reformed* [m]) is a great Commendation of it. Dr. *Pelling*, in his Treatiſe *on the Sacrament*, has made frequent uſe of it, and has enlarged upon it; and may properly be conſulted for thoſe Parts, wherein *Cudworth* Himſelf may ſeem to have been rather too conciſe, and ſparing of Words.

THE *Notion* then being ſufficiently fixed and eſtabliſhed, we have nothing now remaining, but to purſue it in its juſt Conſequences, or Inferences, for the ſupporting the Point in Hand. If the Euchariſt be indeed a *Sacrificial Feaſt*, in ſuch a Senſe as hath been mentioned, it will inevitably follow, that it is alſo a *federal* Banquet, carrying in it the Force of a *Compact*, or *Stipulation* between God and Man. This Concluſion, or Corollary, is drawn out at large by Dr. *Cudworth* in a diſtinct Chapter [n], and ſtill more largely by other learned and judicious Writers [o]; and I need not repeat. Only

[m] See ſeveral of them numbered up by *Moſheim* in Præfat.

[n] *Cudworth*, Ch. VI.

[o] *Pelling* on the Sacrament, Ch. III, IV. Compare Abp. *Pet-*

becauſe

becauſe ſome Exceptions are made to the Evidence, brought to prove that *Covenants* were antiently ſtruck and ratified by *feaſting* together, I may briefly conſider thoſe Exceptions. To the Inſtance of *Iſaac* ſo covenanting with *Abimelech* [p], it is objected, that the Covenant was *ſubſequent* to the Feaſt [q], and therefore there was not a Feaſt *upon*, or *after* a Covenant, as Dr. *Cudworth*'s Notion ſuppoſes. But then it muſt be obſerved, that *Iſaac* and *Abimelech* met together in order to *treat*, and they *ſettled* the *Terms* either *at* the Feaſt, or *before* it; and what was done after, was no more than executing in *Form* the Things before concluded: Beſides, that the whole may be conſidered as but *one continued Act* of covenanting along with a Feaſt. The next Inſtance, is that of *Laban*'s covenanting with *Jacob* by a *Feaſt* [r]: Which is permitted to paſs without any Objection. A third is that of the *Iſraelites* victualling, and thereby covenanting with the *Gibeonites* [s]: To which it is objected, as in the firſt Inſtance, that the Covenant was *ſubſequent* [t]. But the Truth is, the Feaſt and the Covenant were one entire Tranſaction, one federal feaſting, or feſtial covenanting. There are other

ter on Church Government, p. 266. *Vitringa*, Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. III. p. 113. *Dodwell*, One Altar, c. VII. p. 165. *Mede*'s Chriſtian Sacrifice, p. 370. Bp. *Patrick*'s Chriſtian Sacrifice, p. 31. &c.

[p] *Gen.* XXVI. 28 —— 31.

[q] *Moſhem.* in Notis, p. 34.

[r] *Gen.* XXXI. 43 —— 55.

[s] *Joſh.* IX. 14, 15.

[t] *Moſhem.* ibid. p. 34.

the

CHAP. XI.

the like ſlight Exceptions made to other Evidences [v]; which might be as eaſily replied to, were it needful: But I forbear, leſt I ſhould be tedious to the Reader.

THE *Socinians*, in general, are Adverſaries to this *federal* Doctrine, as not conſiſtent with their Principles. Yet ſome of them unawares (ſuch is the Force of Truth) have been obſerved to come into it, or to drop ſuch Expreſſions as appear tantamount. *Crellius* in particular (who was a great Refiner of the *Socinian Syſtem)* ſcruples not to allow, that as in *Circumciſion* formerly, ſo likewiſe in *Baptiſm* and in the *Euchariſt* now, Men bind themſelves to the Obſervance of the Divine Law, as by a Pledge of their Obedience [w]. Which, if admitted, does of courſe imply a reciprocal Engagement, on God's Part, to confer Spiritual Bleſſings and Privileges: So that this Conceſſion does in plain Conſequence amount to declaring Both Sacraments to be *federal Rites* [x].

[v] *Moſhem.* p. 35, &c.

[w] Adde quod *Circumciſio* ſit ſignum quoddam & Teſſera Totius Religionis Judaicæ in Lege præſcriptæ, ita ut eâ ſuſceptâ, veluti pignore ſe Homines *Legi obſtringant*, non aliter quam *Baptiſmus* in Chriſti nomine ſuſceptus, vel etiam *Cœnæ Dominicæ* uſus Teſſera quædam eſt & Symbolum Chriſtianiſmi. *Crellius* in Gal. V. 3.

[x] The Senſe of the *Primitive* Church, with regard to the Euchariſt as a *Covenanting* Rite, may be learned from the famous Paſſage of *Pliny* quoted above, Ch. I. p. 40. To which agrees that Paſſage of St. *Auſtin. Voventur omnia quæ offeruntur Deo, maxime ſancti Altaris Oblatio, quo* Sacramento *prædicatur noſtrum illud* votum maximum, *quo nos vovimus in Chriſto eſſe manſuros, utique in compage Corporis Chriſti: Cujus rei Sacramentum eſt quod unus panis, unum corpus multi ſumus.* Auguſtin. Epiſt. 149. p. 509. Edit. Bened. It was *binding* themſelves by ſo-

Socinus,

CHAP. XI.

Socinus, being aware that the antient Sacrifices were *federal* Rites, and that they were as *Seals* and *Pledges* of a *Covenant* between God and the People; and being aware alſo, that our Lord, in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, had called the Wine *the Blood of the Covenant*; was diſtreſſed for a Reaſon, why the Euchariſt ſhould not be eſteemed a *federal* Rite, as well as thoſe Sacrifices. At length, He thought to account for it by ſaying, that to the Blood of the Sacrifices *anſwers* the *real* Blood of Chriſt ſhed upon the Croſs, and not the *Wine* in the Lord's Supper [y]. The force of his Reaſoning ſtands only in the *equivocal* Meaning of the Word *Anſwers:* For, if He meant it of the *Antitype* anſwering to the *Type*, it is true what He ſays, that our Lord's real Blood *anſwers*, in that Senſe, to the *Blood* of the Sacrifices; and it anſwers alſo to the *Wine*, the Symbol of it; but if He meant it (as He ought to have meant it) of *Symbol* anſwering to *Symbol*, or of one *typical Service* anſwering to another *typical Service*, by way of *Analogy*; then it is plain, that the *Wine* in the Euchariſt ſo *anſwers* to the *Blood* of the Sacrifices, being that they are Repreſentations of the *ſame Thing*, and are *federal* by the *ſame Virtue*, and under the *like Views*,

lemn *Vow* or *Oath* to abſtain from all Iniquity, and to adhere to Godly Living. Which amounted to a Renewal of their Baptiſmal Covenant. Such a way of Covenanting with God by ſolemn *Vow*, or *Oath* is not without Precedent under the Old Teſtament. *Deut* XXIX. 12. 2 *Chron.* XV. 14 *Ezra* X. 5. *Nehem.* X. 29. And ſo God alſo covenanted by *Oath* with Men. *Iſa* XVI. 8

[y] *Socin.* de uſu & fine Cœnæ, p. 46. alias 761.

and

CHAP. XI.

and therefore fitly anſwer to each other, as *analogous* Rites.

Dr. *Pelling* refutes the ſame Objection thus: "Tho' we grant what *Socinus* affirms, that it "is not the *Wine* but the *Blood* of Chriſt, which "*anſwers* to the antient Sacrifices; yet ſince "the Wine is the *Repreſentation* and *Commu-* "*nication* of Chriſt's Blood, we muſt conclude "that it *communicates* thoſe Benefits, for which "that Blood was ſhed; and conſequently that "it *ſeals* that Covenant to every faithful Com- "municant *in particular*, which the Blood of "Chriſt ſealed to all Mankind *in general*. And "as it is true that our Saviour's *Paſſion* did "*anſwer* thoſe *Sacrifices*, which were offered "up of old; ſo it is true alſo, that this *Holy* "*Banquet* doth *anſwer* thoſe *Sacrificial* Feaſts, "which were uſed of old [z]." The Sum of all is this: The *legal* Sacrifices were *federal* Rites, binding *legal* Stipulations directly, and indirectly *Evangelical* Stipulations alſo, ſhadowed out by the other: The Goſpel Sacraments, which by St. *Paul*'s Account (in 1 *Cor.* X.) bear an *Analogy* to thoſe legal Sacrifices, do likewiſe *bind* in a way proper to them, and as ſuits with the *Goſpel State:* Therefore they do directly fix and ratify *Evangelical* Stipulations. Theſe are properly *federal* Rites of the Goſpel State, as the other were properly *federal* Rites of the legal Oeconomy.

It may be aſked, why *verbal* Profeſſions, or *repeated* Acknowledgments may not amount

[z] *Pelling* on the Lord's Supper, p. 106.

to

to a *Renewal* of a Covenant, as much as a *Sacrament?* The Reaſon is plain: *Verbal* Profeſſions are not the federal *Form* preſcribed; and beſides, at the moſt, they amount only to *verbal Engagements*, and that but on *one Side*, and therefore expreſs no *mutual* Contract. They amount not to a *Communion* of Chriſt's Body, or a *Participation* of his Sacrifice: They are not *the new Covenant* in Chriſt's Blood: They are not *drinking* into *one Spirit*, nor *Pledges* of our Union in *one Body*, like as the partaking of *one Loaf*, and of *one Cup* is. In ſhort, *Sacraments* are Tranſactions of two Parties, wherein *God* bears a Share as well as *Man*, and where the viſible Signs have an *inſeparable* Conjunction with the inviſible Graces ſignified, when duly adminiſtred to Perſons *worthy*. *Verbal* Profeſſions, ſingly conſidered, come far ſhort of what has been mentioned, and therefore cannot be preſumed to amount to a *renewal* of a *Covenant*, like the other. CHAP. XI.

IT may be pleaded perhaps, that *Repentance* is the beſt *renewal* of our Covenant, and is more properly ſo, than any *Sacrament* can be. But, on the other hand, it is certain, that Repentance is rather a *Qualification*, on our Part, for renewing, than a *Form* or *Rite* of Renewal; and it expreſſes only what *Man* does, not what *God* does at the ſame time; and therefore it amounts not to *mutual* Contract. The *Terms* of a Covenant ought to be diſtinguiſhed from *Acts* of covenanting, and the *Things* ſtipulated from the *Stipulation* itſelf, or from the *federal*

CHAP. XI.

Forms. To be ſhort, Repentance is properly the *renewal* of the *Man*; but the *renewal* of a *Covenant* is quite another Thing, and muſt include the reciprocal Acts of both Parties. It is very wrong to argue, that any Act, or Performance of *one Party* only, can be *federal*, like a *Sacrament* which takes in *Both*, and includes both *Part*, and *Counterpart*. But the Aim ſeems to be, to throw *God*'s Part out of the Sacraments, and then indeed they would not be *federal* Rites, no nor *Sacraments*, in any juſt Senſe.

I KNOW of no material Objection farther, ſo far as concerns the preſent Article, and ſo I proceed to a new Chapter.

CHAP. XII.

The Service of the EUCHARIST *conſidered in a Sacrificial View.*

THAT the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, in whole or in part, in a Senſe proper or improper, is a *Sacrifice* of the Chriſtian Church, is a Point agreed upon among all knowing and ſober Divines, *Popiſh*, *Lutheran*, or *Reformed*. But the *Romaniſts* have ſo often and ſo grievouſly abuſed the once innocent Names of *Oblation*, *Sacrifice*, *Propitiation*, &c. perverting them to an ill Senſe, and grafting falſe Doctrine and falſe Worſhip upon them, that the *Proteſtants* have been juſtly jealous of

admitting thoſe Names, or ſcrupulouſly wary and reſerved in the uſe of them. CHAP. XII.

THE general way, among both *Lutheran* and *Reformed*, has been to reject any *proper* Propitiation, or *proper* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt; admitting however of ſome kind of *Propitiation* in a qualified Senſe, and of *Sacrifice* alſo, but of a *Spiritual* kind, and therefore ſtyled *improper*, or *metaphorical*. Nevertheleſs Mr. *Mede*, a very learned and judicious Divine and Proteſtant, ſcrupled not to aſſert a *proper* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt (as he termed it) a *material* Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of *Bread* and *Wine*, analogous to the *Mincha* of the old Law[a]. This Doctrine He delivered in the College Chapel, *A. D.* 1635. which was afterwards publiſhed with Improvements, under the Title of *The Chriſtian Sacrifice*. In the Year 1642. the no leſs learned Dr. *Cudworth* printed his well known Treatiſe on the ſame Subject; wherein He as plainly denies any *proper*, or any *material* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt[b]; but admits of a *Symbolical* Feaſt upon a Sacrifice[c], that is to ſay, upon the grand Sacrifice itſelf *commemorated* under certain *Symbols*. This appears to have been the prevailing Doctrine of our Divines, both before and ſince. There can be no doubt of the current Doctrine down to Mr. *Mede*: And as to what has moſt pre-

[a] See *Mede*'s Work, p 355. Edit. 3. A. D. 1672.

[b] *Cudworth*'s True Notion of the Lord's Supper, Chap. V. pag. 77.

[c] *Cudworth*, ibid. p. 21, 78.

CHAP. XII.

vailed ſince, I need only refer to three very eminent Divines, who wrote in the Years 1685, 1686, 1688[d].

IN the Year 1702, the very pious and learned Dr. *Grabe* publiſhed his *Irenæus*, and in his Notes upon the Author, fell in with the Sentiments of Mr. *Mede*, ſo far as concerns a *proper* and *material* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt *: And after Him, our incomparably learned and judicious Biſhop *Bull*, in an Engliſh Treatiſe, gave great countenance to the ſame[e].

Dr. *Grabe*'s declaring for a *proper* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, and at the ſame time cenſuring both *Luther* and *Calvin*, by Name, for rejecting it, gave great alarm to the learned *Proteſtants* abroad, and excited ſeveral of them to re-examine the Queſtion about the Euchariſtical *Sacrifice*.

THE firſt who appeared was the excellent *Buddeus*[f] (*A. D.* 1705.) a *Lutheran* Divine of eſtabliſhed Character for Learning, Temper, and Judgment; tho' He happened to betray ſome Precipitancy in this matter: He appeared much concerned at what Dr. *Grabe* had written on this Argument, but miſapprehended Him all the time, as was natural for Him to do: For, imagining that Dr. *Grabe* had

[d] Dr. *Pelling* on the Sacrament, p. 41 —— 47.
Dr. *Sharpe* (afterwards Archbiſhop) Vol. VII. Serm. II.
Dr. *Payne*'s Diſc. of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, p. 42 —— 54.

* *Grabe* in Iren. Lib. IV. cap. 32. p. 323. Edit. Oxon.

[e] Biſhop *Bull*'s Anſwer to the Biſhop of *Meaux*, p. 18, 19.

[f] *Buddeus* de Origine Miſſæ Pontificiæ, Miſcell. Sacr. Tom. I. pag. 3 —— 63.

maintained

maintained a *real* Preſence in the *Lutheran* Senſe, and a *proper* Sacrifice beſides, the Conſequence was ſelf-evident, that ſuch a *Preſence* and *Sacrifice* together could reſolve into nothing elſe but the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*. Therefore He treats Dr. *Grabe* all the way, as one that had aſſerted the *Popiſh Sacrifice:* And what confirmed Him in the injurious Suſpicion was, that ſome of the *Jeſuits*[g] (whether ignorantly or artfully) had boaſted of Dr. *Grabe* as a declared Man on their Side, againſt both *Luther* and *Calvin*. However, *Buddeus*'s Diſſertation on the Subject is a well-penned Performance, and may be of good Service to every careful Reader, for the light it gives into the main Queſtion. CHAP. XII.

IN the Year 1706, a very learned *Calviniſt*[h] occaſionally engaged in the ſame Queſtion about the *Sacrifice:* Not with any view to Dr. *Grabe* (ſo far as appears) but in oppoſition only to the *Romaniſts*. However, I thought it proper juſt to make mention of Him here, as falling within the ſame time, and being a great Maſter of Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity.

SOME time after (*A. D.* 1709.) *Ittigius*, a learned *Lutheran*, took occaſion to paſs ſome Strictures upon Dr. *Grabe* in that Article[i]: Then *Deylingius*[k] and *Zornius*[l], learned *Lutherans*, and all ſtill purſuing the ſame Miſtake which *Buddeus* had fallen into.

[g] Memoirs pour l'Hiſtoire des Sciences, &c. A.D. 1703.
[h] *Sam. Baſnage* Annal. Tom. I. p. 370 —— 374.
[i] *Ittigius* Hiſtor. Eccleſ. primi Sæc. p. 204.
[k] *Deylingius* Obſervat. Sacr. Tom. I. N. LIV. p. 262.
[l] *Zornius* Opuſcul. Sacr. Tom. I. p. 732.

CHAP. XII.

BUT in the Year 1715, the acute and candid *Pfaffius* (a *Lutheran* alſo) took care to do Juſtice to Dr. *Grabe*'s Sentiments (tho' not altogether approving them) being ſo fair as to own, that Dr. *Grabe*'s Notion of the Euchariſtical *Sacrifice* was nothing akin to the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*[m]. Nevertheleſs others ſtill went on in the firſt Miſtake: And among the reſt, the celebrated *Le Clerc*[n], and a greater Man than He, *Campegius Vitringa*[o]; and another fine Writer[p], later than Both; all of them condemning the Doctrine, wrongfully, as *Popiſh*. But it may be proper here to take notice, that the learned *Deylingius*, who had formerly charged Dr. *Grabe* too haſtily, has, upon better Information, retracted that Cenſure, in a Book lately publiſhed[q]: And the Complaint now is, not that Dr. *Grabe* aſſerted the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs* (which He heartily abhorred) but that He rejected the *real*, local, or corporal *Preſence*[r], ſuch as the *Papiſts* or *Lutherans* contend for: In which moſt certainly He judged right.

BUT before I cloſe this brief Hiſtorical View of that Controverſy, it may not be improper to obſerve how far the learned *Pfaffius* was inclinable to concur with Dr. *Grabe* in this Article. He allows that the Ancients, by *Oblation* and *Sacrifice*, meant more than *Prayer*, and

m *Pfaffius*, Irenæi Fragm. Anecdot. p. 106, &c. 499.
n *Clerici* Hiſtor. Eccl. p. 772.
o *Vitringa* in Iſa. Tom. II. p. 951.
p *Moſheim*, A. D. 1733. in Præfat. ad Cudworth de Cœna.
q *Deylingius*, Obſervat. Miſcel. p. 103. A. D. 1736.
r Vid. *Deylingius*, ibid. p. 77.

that

that it is even ludicrous to pretend the contrary[r]. He acknowledges that They ſpeak of an *Oblation* of *Bread* and *Wine*[t], and that the Euchariſt is a *Sacrifice* of *Praiſe*[u], and *propitiatory* alſo in a qualified ſober Senſe[w]. In ſhort, He ſeems almoſt to yield up every Thing that Dr. *Grabe* had contended for, excepting only the Point of a *proper*, or *material* Sacrifice: And He looked upon That as reſolving at length into a kind of *Logomachy*, a difference in *Words* or *Names*, ariſing chiefly from the Difficulty of determining what a *Sacrifice* properly means, and from the almoſt inſuperable Perplexities among learned Men, about the aſcertaining any preciſe *Definition* of it[x]. I am perſuaded, there is a good deal of Truth in what that learned Gentleman has ſaid, and that a great Part of the Debate, ſo warmly carried on a few Years ago, was more about *Names*, than Things. CHAP. XII.

As the Queſtion ariſes chiefly out of what was taught by the ancient *Fathers*, it will be proper to enquire what they really meant by the Word *Sacrifice*, and in what Senſe They applied that Name to the Euchariſt, in whole or in part. St. *Auſtin*, who well underſtood both what the *Scripture* and the *Chriſtian Writers* before Him had taught, defines or deſcribes a *true Sacrifice*, in the general, as follows: "*A true* "*Sacrifice* is any Work done to keep up our

[r] *Pfaffius*, ibid. p. 50.
[t] *Pfaffius*, ibid. p. 254 —— 274, 314, 344.
[u] *Pfaffius*, ibid. p. 330, 338.
[w] *Pfaffius*, 211, 229.
[x] *Pfaffius*, in Præfat. & p. 344, 345.

CHAP. XII.

"League of Amity with God, referred to Him "as our Sovereign Good, in whom we may en- "joy true Felicity[y]." I follow his Senſe, rather than the ſtrict Letter, to make it the clearer to an Engliſh Reader. St. *Auſtin* here judged it neceſſary for every ſuch good Work to be performed with a *view to God*, to be *referred* to his *Glory*; otherwiſe it could not with any propriety be called a *Sacrifice* to Him: Therefore even Works of *Mercy* done to Man, out of Compaſſion, Tenderneſs, or Humanity, tho' *true Sacrifices* if conſidered as done with a *view to God*, would be no *Sacrifice* at all, if they wanted that Circumſtance to recommend them[z]. From hence we may ſee what that Father's general Notion of a *true Sacrifice* was. He takes notice farther, that what had been commonly called *Sacrifice*, is really nothing more than an outward *Sign*, *Token*, or *Symbol* of true Sacrifice[a]. The Diſtinction here made may afford great Light as to the Meaning of the

[y] *Verum Sacrificium* eſt, omne opus quod agitur ut ſancta Societate inhæreamus Deo, relatum ſcilicet ad illum Finem Boni, quo veraciter Beati eſſe poſſimus. *Auguſtin.* de Civit. Dei, Lib. X. cap. 6. p. 242.

[z] Miſericordia *verum Sacrificium* eſt. —— Ipſa miſericordia qua Homini ſubvenitur, ſi *propter Deum* non fit, non eſt *Sacrificium*. —— Sacrificium *res divina* eſt, &c. *Auguſtin.* ibid.

[a] Illud quod ab omnibus appellatur *Sacrificium*, *Signum* eſt veri Sacrificii. *Auguſtin.* ibid. Nec quod ab antiquis Patribus talia Sacrificia facta ſunt in victimis pecorum (quod nunc Dei Populus *legit*, non *facit*) aliud intelligendum eſt, niſi rebus illis eas res fuiſſe *ſignificatas* quæ aguntur in nobis, in hoc ut *adhæreamus Deo*, & ad eundem Finem *Proximo* conſulamus. Sacrificium ergo *viſibile*, inviſibilis Sacrificii *Sacramentum*, id eſt, *Sacrum Signum* eſt. Ibid. cap. 5.

Ancients,

Ancients, where they denominate the Euchariſt a *Sacrifice*, or a *true* and *perfect* Sacrifice. They meant, for the moſt part, that it was true and *Evangelical Service*, as oppoſed to *Legal:* In that Senſe, the Euchariſtical Service was itſelf *true Sacrifice*, and properly *our* Sacrifice. And if, over and above, the *Elements* themſelves, unconſecrated, were ever called a *Sacrifice*, or *Sacrifices*, the meaning ſtill was, that the *Service* was the Sacrifice: But when the *conſecrated* Elements had that Name, it was only a metonymy of the *Sign* for the *Thing ſignified*, as they *repreſent*, and in effect exhibit the grand Sacrifice of the Croſs. CHAP. XII.

IT is worth obſerving, that in Scripture-Style, whatever exhibits any Advantage or Bleſſing in larger meaſure, or in a more eminent degree, is denominated *true*, in oppoſition to other Things which only *appear* to do the like, or do it but *defectively*[b]. In ſuch a Senſe as that, the Goſpel Services are the *true* Sacrifices, called alſo under the Law, *Sacrifices of Righteouſneſs*[c]. I know not how it comes to paſs, that *Moderns* generally have reckoned all the *Spiritual* Sacrifices among the *nominal*, *improper*, *metaphorical* Sacrifices; whereas the

[b] See *John* I. 4, 9, 17. VI. 32. IX. 23, 24. XV. 1. *Luke* XVI. 11. *Hebrews* VIII. 2. IX. 11, 24.

[c] *Vera* Sacrificia ſunt ejuſmodi Sacrificia, quæ *vere* id habent quod cætera habere *videntur*. Dicuntur illa, eodem loquendi modo, *Sacrificia Juſtitiæ*, id eſt, θυσίαι ἀληθειας, *Sacrificia vera*. Intelligitur autem hac Phraſi *Totus cultus* Novi Teſtamenti. *Vitringa* de vet. Synag. p. 65. conf. ejuſd. *Obſervat. Sacr.* Tom. II. p. 499. & in *Iſa.* Tom. II. p. 56, 733, 829.

Ancients

CHAP. XII.

Ancients judged them to be the *trueſt* Sacrifices of any, yea and infinitely more *excellent* than the other. If it be ſaid, that external, material, ſymbolical Sacrifices had all along ingroſſed the Name of *Sacrifices*, and therefore were the only Sacrifices *properly* ſo called, as the *Cuſtom* of Language is the Rule of *Propriety*; it may be replied on the other hand, that *Spiritual* Sacrifices really carry in them all that the other *ſignify* or *point to*, and ſo, upon the *general Reaſon* of all Sacrifice, have a juſt, or a more eminent Title to that Name: And this may be thought as good a Rule of *Propriety*, as the Cuſtom of Language can be. Suppoſe, for inſtance, that *Sacrifice*, in its general nature, means the *making a Preſent* to the Divine Majeſty, as *Plato* defines it[d]; is not the *preſenting* Him with our *Prayers*, *Praiſes*, and *good Works*, as properly *making Him a Preſent*, as the other? Therefore if the general Reaſon or Definition of *Sacrifice* ſuits as *properly* (yea and *eminently*) with *Spiritual* Sacrifices as with any other, I ſee not why they ſhould not be eſteemed *proper* Sacrifices, as well as the other. However, ſince this would amount only to a Strife about *Words*, it is of no great moment, whether *Spiritual* Sacrifices be called *proper* or *improper* Sacrifices, ſo long as they are allowed to be *true*, and *excellent*, and as much to be preferred before the other, as *Subſtance* before *Shadow*, and *Truth* before *Sign*

[d] Οὐκοῦν τὸ θύειν, δωρεᾶσθαί ἐστι τοῖς θεοῖς. Plato in Euthyphron. pag. 10.

or

or *Figure*. The *Ancients*, I think, looked upon the *Spiritual* Sacrifices as *true* and *proper* Sacrifices, and are ſo to be underſtood, whenever They apply the Name of *Sacrifice* to the *Service* of the Euchariſt. But to make it a *material* Sacrifice, would, in their account, have been degrading and vilifying it, reducing it to a *Legal* Ceremony, inſtead of a *Goſpel Service*. CHAP. XII.

THE Service therefore of the Euchariſt, on the foot of ancient Church Language, is both a *true* and a *proper* Sacrifice (as I ſhall ſhew preſently) and the nobleſt that we are capable of offering, when conſidered as comprehending under it *many* true and Evangelical Sacrifices: 1. The Sacrifice of *Alms* to the Poor, and *Oblations* to the Church; which when Religiouſly intended, and offered through Chriſt, is a *Goſpel Sacrifice*[e]. Not that the *material* Offering is a Sacrifice to *God*, for it goes intirely to the uſe of *Man*; but the *Service* is what God accepts. 2. The Sacrifice of *Prayer*, from a pure Heart, is Evangelical *Incenſe*[f]. 3. The Sacrifice of *Praiſe* and *Thankſgiving* to God the Father, thro' Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, is another *Goſpel Sacrifice*[g]. 4. The Sacrifice of a *penitent* and *contrite* Heart, even under the *Law* (and now much more under the *Goſpel*, when *ex-*

[e] *Phil.* IV. 18. *Hebrews* XIII. 16. Compare *Acts* X. 4. *Eccluſ.* XXXV. 2

[f] *Revel.* V. 8. VIII. 3, 4. Compare *Pſalm* CXLI. 2. *Malach.* I. 11. III. 4, 5. *Hoſ.* XIV. 2. *Acts* X. 4. *Eccluſ.* XXXV. 2.

[g] *Hebr.* XIII. 15. 1 *Pet.* II. 5, 9. Compare *Pſalm* L. 14, 15. CXVI. 17. LXIX. 31.

plicitely

CHAP. XII.

plicitely offered thro' Chriſt) was a Sacrifice of the *new* Covenant[h]: For the *new Covenant* commenced from the time of the Fall, and obtained under the *Law*, but couched under *Shadows* and Figures. 5. The Sacrifice of *ourſelves*, our *Souls* and *Bodies*, is another *Goſpel Sacrifice*[i]. 6. The offering up the *myſtical Body* of Chriſt, that is, his *Church*, is another Goſpel Sacrifice[k]: Or rather, it is coincident with the former; excepting that there Perſons are conſidered in their *ſingle* capacity, and here *collectively* in a Body. I take the Thought from St. *Auſtin*[l], who grounds it chiefly on 1 *Cor.* X. 17. and the Texts belonging to the former Article. 7. The offering up of true *Converts*, or ſincere *Penitents* to God, by their *Paſtors*, who have laboured ſucceſsfully in the Bleſſed Work, is another very acceptable *Goſpel Sacrifice*[m]. 8. The Sacrifice of *Faith* and *Hope*, and *Self-humiliation*, in *commemorating* the *grand Sacrifice*, and reſting finally upon it, is another *Goſpel Sacrifice*[n], and eminently proper to the *Euchariſt*.

THESE, I think, are all ſo many *true* Sacrifices, and may all meet together in the one

[h] *Pſal.* LI. 17. IV. 5. *Iſa.* I. 16. LVII. 15.
[i] *Rom.* XII. 1. VI. 13. *Phil.* II. 17. 2 *Tim.* IV. 6.
[k] 1 *Cor.* X. 17.
[l] *Auguſtin.* de Civit. Dei, Lib. X. cap. 6. p. 243. Cap. XX. p. 256. Epiſt. 59 alias 149. p. 509. Ed. Bened.
[m] *Rom.* XV. 16. *Phil.* II. 17. Comp. *Iſa.* LVI. 20. cum Notis *Vitring.* p. 950.
[n] This is not ſaid in any ſingle Text, but may be clearly collected from many compared.

great complicated *Sacrifice of the Euchariſt.* Into ſome one or more of theſe may be reſolved (as I conceive) all that the *Ancients* have ever taught of *Chriſtian* Sacrifices, or of the Euchariſt under the Name or Notion of a *true* or *proper Sacrifice.* Let it be *ſuppoſed* however for the preſent, in order to give the Reader the clearer Idea beforehand, of what I intend preſently to *prove.* In the mean while, ſuppoſing this Account to be juſt, from hence may eaſily be underſtood how far the Euchariſt is a *commemorative Sacrifice*, or otherwiſe. If that Phraſe means a *Spiritual Service* of ours, commemorating the *Sacrifice* of the *Croſs*, then it is juſtly ſtyled a *Sacrifice* commemorative of a *Sacrifice*, and in that Senſe, a *commemorative Sacrifice:* But if that Phraſe points only to the outward *Elements* repreſenting the *Sacrifice* made by Chriſt, then it means a *Sacrifice commemorated*, or a *Repreſentation* and *Commemoration of a Sacrifice*[o].

CHAP. XII.

FROM hence likewiſe may we underſtand in what Senſe the officiating authorized *Miniſters* perform the Office of proper, Evangelical

[o] Nonne ſemel *immolatus* eſt Chriſtus in ſeipſo? Et tamen in *Sacramento* non ſolum per omnes Paſchæ ſolennitates, ſed omni die Populis *immolatur*; nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus, *eum* reſponderit *immolari*. Si enim Sacramenta quandam *ſimilitudinem* earum rerum, quarum Sacramenta ſunt, non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non eſſent: ex hac autem *ſimilitudine* plerumque etiam ipſarum rerum *nomina* accipiunt. Sicut ergo, ſecundum quendam modum, *Sacramentum* Corporis Chriſti *Corpus* Chriſti eſt, *Sacramentum* Sanguinis Chriſti *Sanguis* Chriſti eſt; ita Sacramentum Fidei Fides eſt. *Auguſtin.* Epiſt. ad Bonifacium 98. (alias 23.) p. 267. Edit. Bened.

Prieſts

CHAP. XII.

Prieſts in this Service. They do it three ways: 1. As *commemorating*, in ſolemn Form, the ſame *Sacrifice* here below, which Chriſt our *High Prieſt* commemorates above. 2. As handing up (if I may ſo ſpeak) thoſe *Prayers*, and thoſe *Services* of Chriſtians to Chriſt our Lord, who as *High Prieſt* recommends the ſame in Heaven to God the Father[p]. 3. As offering up to God all the *Faithful* who are under their care and miniſtry, and who are *ſanctified* by the *Spirit*[q]. In theſe three ways the Chriſtian Officers are *Prieſts*, or *Liturgs* to very excellent Purpoſes, far above the *Legal* ones, in a Senſe worth the contending for, and worth the purſuing with the utmoſt Zeal and Aſſiduity.

HAVING thus far intimated beforehand what I apprehend to be in the main, or in the general, a juſt Account of the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice*, upon the Principles laid down in *Scripture*, as interpreted by the *Ancients*; I ſhall next proceed to examine the *Ancients* one by one, in order to ſee whether this Account tallies with what They have ſaid upon this Article.

I SHALL begin with St. *Barnabas*, ſuppoſed, with ſome probability, to have been the Author of the Epiſtle bearing his Name, penned about *A. D.* 71. This very early Writer, taking notice of the difference between the *Law* and the *Goſpel*, obſerves that Chriſt had aboliſhed the *legal Sacrifices*, to make way for an

[p] *Revel.* VIII. 5. Vid. *Vitring.* in loc.
[q] *Rom.* XV. 16.

Human

Human Oblation[r]: Which He explains ſoon after, by an *humble and contrite Heart*, referring to *Pſalm* li. 17. So by *Human Oblation*, He means the *free-will* offering of the *Heart*, as oppoſed to the *Yoke* of *Legal* obſervances; the offering up the *whole inner Man*, inſtead of the *outward* ſuperficial Performances of the *Law*. Therefore the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*, as here deſcribed by our Author, reſolves into the *5th* Article of the Account which I have given above. Mr. *Dodwell* renders the words of *Barnabas* thus: "Theſe Things therefore He has "evacuated, that the *new Law* of our Lord "Jeſus Chriſt, which is without any *Yoke* of "*Bondage*, might bring in the *myſtical Obla-*"*tion*[s]." He conceived the original *Greek* Words (which are loſt) might have been λογικὴ λατρεία, *reaſonable Service*: Which however is merely conjecture. But He underſtood the Place, of Chriſtians offering *Themſelves*, their *Souls* and *Bodies*, inſtead of ſacrificing *Beaſts*. Another learned Man, who had an Hypotheſis to ſerve, underſtands by *Human Oblation*, an Offering made *with freedom*; and He interprets it of the *voluntary* Oblations made by Communicants at the Altar, *viz.* the *Lay-Oblations*[t]. The Interpretation appears ſomewhat forced, and agrees

CHAP. XII.

[r] Hæc ergo [Sacrificia] vacua fecit, ut nova Lex Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, quæ ſine jugo neceſſitatis eſt, *humanam* habeat *oblationem* —— nobis enim dicit, *Sacrificium Deo*, cor tribulatum, & humiliatum Deus non deſpicit. *Pſal.* LI. 17. *Barnab.* Epiſt. cap. II. pag. 57.

[s] *Dodwell* of Incenſing, p. 33, &c.

[t] *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 333. alias 338.

not

CHAP. XII.

not well with *Barnabas*'s own Explication ſuperadded, concerning an *humble* and *contrite Heart*; unleſs we take in Both: However, even upon that Suppoſition, the Chriſtian Sacrifice here pointed to, will be a *Spiritual Sacrifice*, or *Service*, the Sacrifice of *charitable Benevolence*, and will fall under Article the *firſt*, above mentioned. There have not been wanting ſome who would wreſt the Paſſage ſo far, as to make it favour the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*: But the learned *Pfaffius*[u] has abundantly confuted every Pretence that way, and has alſo well defended the common Conſtruction; which *Menardus* had before admitted, and which *Dodwell* alſo came into, and which I have here recommended. There is nothing more in *Barnabas* that relates at all to our Purpoſe, and ſo we may paſs on to other Chriſtian Writers in order.

Clemens of *Rome* has been cited in a Chapter above[w], as ſpeaking of the *Lay-Oblations* brought to the Altar, and of the *ſacerdotal* Oblation afterwards made of the ſame *Gifts*, previouſly to the *Conſecration*. No doubt but ſuch *Lay-Offerings* amounted to *Spiritual Sacrifice*, being acceptable Service under the Goſpel; and they fall under Article the *firſt*, in the enumeration before given. I cannot repeat too often, that in ſuch Caſes, the *Service*, the *good Work*, the *Duty* performed is properly the *Sacrifice*, according to the *Definition* of Sacrifice in Saint

[u] *Pfaffius* de Oblat. vet. Euchariſt. Sect. XXII. p. 239, &c.
[w] See above, Chap. I. p. 33.

Auſtin

Auſtin[x] above cited, and according to plain good Senſe. When *Cornelius*'s Prayers and Alms aſcended up for a *Memorial* (a Name alluding to the Legal *Incenſe*) it was not his *Money*, nor any *material* Gifts that *aſcended*, or made the *Memorial*; but it was the *Piety*, the *Mercy*, the *Beneficence*, the *Virtues* of the Man. Under the Goſpel, God receives no *material* Thing at all, to be conſumed and ſpent in his own *immediate* Service, and for his *Honour* only: He receives no *Blood*, no *Libation*, no *Incenſe*, no *Burnt-Offerings*, no *Perfumes*, as before. If He receives *Alms* and *Oblations* (as in the Euchariſtical Service) He receives them not as *Gifts* to Himſelf, to be conſumed in his *immediate* Service, but as Gifts to be conſecrated for the *uſe* of *Man*, to whom they go. All that is *material* is laid out upon Man only; not upon *God*, as in the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy. But God receives, now under the Goſpel, our Religious *Services*, our *good Works*, our *virtuous Exerciſes*, in the Name of Chriſt, and theſe are our truly Chriſtian and Spiritual *Sacrifices*. In this view, the *Lay Oblations* which *Clemens* refers to, were *Chriſtian Sacrifices*. So alſo were the *Sacerdotal* Services, referred to by the ſame *Clemens*; tho' in a view ſomewhat different, and falling under a diſtinct Branch of *Goſpel-Sacrifice*, re-

CHAP. XII.

[x] *Omne Opus*, &c. *every good Work*. And it is obſervable, that, conformably to ſuch definition, that *Father* makes *Baptiſm* a *Sacrifice*: *Holocauſto Dominicæ paſſionis, quod eo tempore offert quiſque pro peccatis ſuis, quo ejuſdem paſſionis Fide dedicatur, & Chriſtianorum Fidelium nomine Baptizatus imbuitur.* Auguſtin. ad Roman. Expoſ. cap. XIX. col. 937. Tom. III,

CHAP. XII.

ducible to Article the *ſeventh* in the foregoing recital. Thoſe who endeavour to conſtrue *Clemens*'s προσφοραὶ and λειτουργίαι (*Oblations* and *Sacerdotal Miniſtrations*) as favouring the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*, run altogether wide of the Truth; as is plain from one ſingle Reaſon among many[y], that all which *Clemens* ſpeaks of, was *previous* to the Conſecration. Thoſe alſo who plead from thence for *material* Oblations, as *acceptable* under the Goſpel, miſtake the Caſe: For the *material* Part (as before hinted) goes not to *God*, is not conſidered purely as a *Gift* to Him (like the *Burnt-Offerings* or *Incenſe* under the Law, *conſumed* in his *immediate* Service) but as a *Gift* for the *uſe* of *Man*; and ſo nothing remains for God to *accept* of, as given to Him, but the *Spiritual Service*; and even that He accepts not of, unleſs it really anſwers its Name. So that it is plain that the New Teſtament admits of none but *Spiritual Sacrifices*; becauſe none elſe are now properly *given* to God, or *accepted* by Him as ſo given.

Juſtin Martyr, of the ſecond Century, is ſo clear and ſo expreſs upon the Subject of *Goſpel-Sacrifice*, that one need not deſire any fuller Light than He will furniſh us with. The Sum of his Doctrine is, that *Prayers* and *Praiſes*, and *univerſal Obedience* are the only *Chriſtian Sacrifices*: From whence it moſt evidently follows, that whenever He gives the Name of *Oblation*,

[y] The Reader may ſee that whole Queſtion diſcuſſed at large in *Buddeus* Miſcellan. Sacr. Tom. I. p. 45 —— 49.
Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Euchariſt. p. 254 —— 269.

lation, or *Sacrifice*, to the Euchariſt, his whole meaning is, that it is a Religious *Service* comprehending *Prayers*, *Praiſes*, &c. and therefore has a juſt Title to the Name of Chriſtian *Oblation* and *Sacrifice*. But let us examine the Paſſages. CHAP. XII.

HE writes thus: " We have been taught, " that God has no need of any *material Ob-* " *lation* from Men; well knowing, that He is " the giver of all Things: But we are inform- " ed, and perſuaded, and do believe, that He " *accepts* Thoſe only who copy after his mo- " ral Perfections, *Purity*, *Righteouſneſs*, *Phi-* " *lanthropy*[z]," &c. Here we may obſerve, that God accepts not, according to our Author, any *material* Oblation at all, conſidered as a *Gift to Him*, nor any Thing but what is *Spiritual*, as all Religious Services, and all virtuous Exerciſes really are: Thoſe are the *Goſpel Oblations* according to *Juſtin*, here and every where. A few Pages after, He takes notice, " that God has no need of *Blood*, *Libations*, or " *Incenſe*, but that the Chriſtian manner was, " to offer Him *Prayers* and *Thankſgivings* for " all the Bleſſings they enjoy, to the utmoſt " of their Power: That the only way of pay- " ing Him *Honour ſuitable*, was not to *conſume* " *by Fire* what He had given for our Suſtenance,

[z] Ἀλλ' οὐ δέεσθαι τῆς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑλικῆς προσφορᾶς προσειλήφαμεν τὸν θεὸν, αὐτὸν παρέχοντα πάντα ὁρῶντες· ἐκείνους δὲ προσδέχεσθαι αὐτὸν μόνον δεδιδάγμεθα, καὶ πεπείσμεθα, καὶ πιστεύομεν, τοὺς τὰ προσήκοντα αὐτῷ ἀγαθὰ μιμουμένους, σωφροσύνῃ, καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ, καὶ ὅσα οἰκεῖα θεῷ ἐστι. *Juſt. Mart.* Apol. 1. p. 14. Edit. Lond.

CHAP. XII.

" but to ſpend it upon *ourſelves*, and upon the " *Poor*, and to render Him the Tribute of our " grateful *Hymns* and *Praiſes*[a]," &c.

HERE we may note how exactly He points out the difference between other *Sacrifices* (Pagan or Jewiſh) and the Sacrifices of the *Goſpel*. In *thoſe* there was ſomething *ſpent*, as it were, immediately upon *God*, entirely *loſt*, *waſted*, *conſumed*, becauſe conſidered as a *Gift to God only*; which is the *proper* Notion of a material *Sacrifice*: But in *theſe*, nothing is entirely *ſpent*, or *conſumed*, but all goes to the *uſe* of *Man*; only the *Praiſe*, the *Glory*, the Tribute of *Homage* and *Service*, That is *given* to God, and That He accepts, as a proper *Sacrifice*, and as moſt ſuitable to his Divine Majeſty. Not that He *needs* even theſe, or can be *benefited* by them: But He takes *delight* in the exerciſe of his own *Philanthropy*, which has ſo much the larger Field to move in, according as his *Creatures* render themſelves fit Objects of it by Acts of Religion and Virtue. But I proceed with our Author.

IN another Place He expreſsly teaches, that " *Prayers* and *Thankſgivings* made by them that " are *worthy*, are the only *perfect* and *accept-* " *able* Sacrifices; adding, that Thoſe only are

[a] Ανενδεῆ αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων —— λέγοντες, λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν ὅσῃ δύναμις, αἰνοῦντες μόνῳ ἀξίαν αὐτῷ, τιμὴν ταύτην ἡγούμενοι, τὸ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς διαφθορὴν γινόμενα, εἰ πυρὶ δαπανᾶν, ἀπ' ἐαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους πέμπειν κ. τ. λ. *Juſt. Mart.* ibid. p. 19.

" offered

" offered in the Euchariſtical *Commemoration*[b]." CHAP. XII.

It is obſervable, that by the Reſtriction to *the worthy*, He ſuppoſes a *good Life* to go along with *Prayers* and *Praiſes* to make them acceptable *Sacrifice*, conformably to what He had before taught, as above recited. Indeed, *Prayers* and *Praiſes* are moſt directly, immediately, emphatically *Sacrifice*, as a Tribute offered to God *only*: Which is the Reaſon why *Juſtin* and other *Fathers* ſpeak of them in the firſt Place, as the proper, or primary *Sacrifices* of Chriſtians. *Obedience* is Sacrifice alſo, as it reſpects *God*; but it may have another Aſpect towards *ourſelves*, or other *Men*, and therefore is not ſo *directly* a Sacrifice to God *alone*. This diſtinction is well illuſtrated by a judicious Divine of our own[c], whoſe words I may here borrow: " The Sacrifice of *Obedience* is *metaphorical*: " that is, God accepts it as well as if it had " been a *Sacrifice*; that is, *ſomething given to* " *Himſelf*: But the Sacrifice of *Praiſe* is *pro-* " *per*, without a *Metaphor*[d]. The nature of it " accompliſhed by offering ſomething to God,

[b] Οτι μὲν οὖν ἡ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι κατὰ τ ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστόι εἰσι τῷ θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ἐκεῖς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς. *Juſtin.* Dial. p. 387.

[c] Biſhop *Lany*'s Sermon on Hebr. XIII. 15. p. 30, 31, 32.

[d] Note, this very acute and knowing Divine had not learned to call every *Spiritual* Sacrifice a *metaphorical* Sacrifice: For, He admits of Prayers and Praiſes, and the like *Religious* Services, as *true* and *proper* Sacrifices. I conceive farther, that even *Obedience*, formally conſidered as reſpecting *God*, and as a *Tribute* offered to *Him* (tho' it has *other views* beſides, in which it is no *Sacrifice* at all) is as properly *Sacrifice* as the other: And ſo judged St. *Auſtin* above cited.

CHAP. XII.

" in acknowledgment of Him. —— The Ho-
" nour which God receives from our *Obedience*,
" differs from that of a *Sacrifice*; for that is
" only of *conſequence*, and by *Argumentation*:
" That is, it ſuits with the nature and will of
" God; as we ſay, *good Servants* are an *Honour*
" to their *Maſters*, by Reflexion. But the Ho-
" nour by *Sacrifice* is of *direct* and *ſpecial* In-
" tendment: it hath *no other uſe*, and is a *di-*
" *ſtinct* Virtue from all *other* Acts of Obedi-
" ence, and of a *different* Obligation. ——
" Tho' God hath the Honour of *Obedience* and
" a *virtuous* Life; if we deny Him the Honour
" of a *Sacrifice* beſides, we rob Him of *his due*,
" and a greater *Sacrilege* we cannot commit.
" —— This is robbing God of the *Service*
" *itſelf*, to which the other, dedicated for his
" Service, are but *acceſſary*." Thus far Biſhop *Lany* to the Point in hand. I return to *Juſtin Martyr*.

WE have ſeen how uniform and conſtant this early Chriſtian Writer was, with reſpect to the *general* Doctrine concerning *Goſpel Sacrifices*, as being *Spiritual* Sacrifices, and no other. Nothing more remains, but to conſider how to reconcile that *general* Doctrine with the *particular* Doctrine taught by the ſame Writer concerning the *Euchariſt*, as a *Sacrifice*. He makes mention of the legal Offering of *fine Flour*, or *Meal Offering*, as a *Type* of the *Bread* of the Euchariſt[e]: And a little after, citing a noted Place of the Prophet *Malachi*, He interprets the *pure*

[e] *Juſtin. Mart.* Dial. p. 220.

Offering,

Offering, the *Mincha*, or *Bread Offering* there predicted, of the *Bread* Euchariſtical, and likewiſe of *Wine*[f], denominating them, as it ſeems, the *Sacrifices* offered by us *Gentile Chriſtians*. Does not all this look very like the admitting of *material* Sacrifices under the Goſpel? And how then could He conſiſtently elſewhere *exclude* all *material* Oblations, and admit none but *Spiritual* Sacrifices as belonging to the Chriſtian State? Mr. *Pfaffius*, being aware of the appearing difficulty, cuts the Knot, inſtead of untying it, and charges the Author with *ſaying* and *unſaying*[g]: Which perhaps was not reſpectful enough towards his Author, nor prudent for his own Cauſe, unleſs the Caſe had been *deſperate*, which he had no Reaſon to ſuſpect, ſo far as I apprehend. He undertakes afterwards, to ſum up *Juſtin*'s Sentiments on this Head, and does it in a manner ſomewhat perplexed, to this effect: "That the new Te-
"ſtament admits of no *Sacrifices* but *Prayers*,
"*Praiſes*, and *Thankſgivings*: But however, if
"it does admit of any Thing *correſponding*, or
"*ſimilar* to the *Legal* Oblations, it is that of
"the Oblation of *Bread* and *Wine* in the Eu-
"chariſt[h]." This is leaving the Readers much in

CHAP. XII.

[f] Περὶ δὲ τῶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶ ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τυτέστι τῶ ἄρτυ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τῶ ποτηρίυ ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας προλέγῳ τότε. *Juſtin.* ibid.

[g] *Pfaffius* de Oblat. vet. Euchariſt. p. 270, 272.

[h] Ita nempe ſecum ſtatuit vir Sanctus, *nulla* eſſe in novo Teſtamento *Sacrificia*, quam *Laudes*, *Gratiarum Actiones*, & *Preces*; ſi quid tamen ſit quod cum oblationibus Veteris Teſtamenti *conferri* queat, eſſe *Panem Vinumque Euchariſtiæ*, quæ Altari, ſeu Menſæ ſacræ impoſita,

CHAP. XII.

in the dark, and his Author to ſhift for *Senſe* and *Conſiſtency*. At the beſt, it is diſmiſſing the Evidence as *doubtful*, not *determinate* enough to give reaſonable Satisfaction.

Mr. *Dodwell*'s Account of *Juſtin* in this Article, is no clearer than the former. He takes notice, that this Father *allows no other Sacrifice but that of Prayer and Euchariſt*; He ſhould have ſaid, *Thankſgiving*: And ſoon after He adds in the ſame Page; *elſewhere He owns no acceptable Sacrifice under the Goſpel, but the Euchariſt; in oppoſition to the Jewiſh Sacrifices, which were conſumed by Fire, and which were confined to Jeruſalem*[i]. Still, here is no account given how *Juſtin* could reject all *material* Sacrifice, and yet conſiſtently admit of the Euchariſt as a *Sacrifice*, if that be a *material*, and not a *Spiritual* Oblation. The moſt that Mr. *Dodwell*'s Solution can amount to, is, that *Juſtin* did not abſolutely reject *material* Sacrifices, provided they were not to be *conſumed by Fire*, or provided (as He hints in another Work[k]) that they are but purely *Euchariſtical*. But this Solution will never account for *Juſtin*'s ſo expreſsly and fully excluding all *material* Oblations, and ſo particularly reſtraining the Notion of *Goſpel Sacrifices* to *Prayers*, *Praiſes*, and *good Works*.

SOME learned Men think, that a *material* Sacrifice may yet be called a *rational* and *Spi-*

poſita, precibuſque juxta mandatum Chriſti Deo oblata, in Sacramentum Corporis Sanguiniſque Dominici conſecrentur. *Pfaffius*, ibid. p. 274.

[i] *Dodwell* of Incenſing, p. 46.

[k] *Dodwell*'s One Altar, p. 203, 204.

ritual

ritual Sacrifice[1]: And therefore, tho' the *Fathers* do expreſsly reject *material* Sacrifices, they mean only Sacrifices of a *certain* kind; and tho' they admit none but *Spiritual* Sacrifices, they might yet tacitly except ſuch *material* Sacrifices as are *Spiritual* alſo. But this appears to be a very harſh Solution, and ſuch as would go near to confound all Language. However, moſt certainly, it ought never to be admitted, if any clearer or juſter Solution can be thought on, as I am perſuaded there may.

Juſtin's Principles, if rightly conſidered, hang well together, and are all of a piece. He rejects all *material* Sacrifices abſolutely: And tho' the Euchariſt be a *Sacrifice*, according to Him, yet it is not the *matter* of it, *viz.* the *Bread* and *Wine*, that is properly the Sacrifice, but it is the *Service* only, and That is a *Spiritual* Sacrifice. *Alms* are a *Goſpel Sacrifice*, according to St. *Paul:* Not the *material* Alms, but the *exerciſe* of *Charity*, That is the Sacrifice. In like manner, the *Euchariſt* is a *Goſpel-Sacrifice:* Not the *material* Symbols, but the *Service*, conſiſting of *Prayer*, *Praiſe*, *contrite Hearts*, *Self-Humiliation*, *&c.* Well, but may not the like be ſaid of all the *Legal* Sacrifices, that there alſo the *Service* was diſtinct from the *Matter*, and ſo thoſe alſo were *Spiritual* Sacrifices? No: The Circumſtances were widely different. In the legal Sacrifices, either the *Whole*, or ſome *Part* of the Offering was directly *given* to

[1] *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 18, &c.

God,

CHAP. XII.

God [m], and either *conſumed by Fire*, or *poured forth*, never returning to the *uſe* of Man: And thereupon was founded the *groſs Notion*, of which God by his Prophets more than once complains [n], as if the Deity had *need* of ſuch Things, or took *delight* in them. But now, under the Goſpel, nothing is ſo *given* to God, nothing *conſumed* in his *immediate* Service: We preſent his *Gifts* and his *Creatures* before Him, and we take them back again for the *uſe* of *ourſelves*, and of *our Brethren*. All that we really give up to *God* as his Tribute, are our *Thanks*, our *Praiſes*, our *Acknowledgments*, our *Homage*, our *Selves*, our *Souls* and *Bodies*; which is all *Spiritual* Sacrifice, purely Spiritual: And herein lies the main difference between the *Law* and the *Goſpel* [o]. We have no *material* Sacrifices at all. The *Matter* of the Euchariſt is *Sacramental*, and the Bread and Wine are *Signs*: yea Signs of a *Sacrifice*, that is of the *Sacrifice* of the *Croſs*: But as to any Sacrifice of *ours*, it lies entirely in the *Service* we perform, and in the *Qualifications*, or *Diſpoſitions* which we bring, which are all ſo much *Spiri-*

[m] Some have thought the *Paſcal Sacrifice* to make an Exception, becauſe it was all to be eaten. But it is certain that one Part, *viz.* the *Blood*, was to be *poured forth*, and *ſprinkled*, 2 *Chron.* XXX. 16. XXXV. 11. yea and *offered* unto God, *Exod.* XXIII. 18. XXXIV. 25. as belonging of right to Him: And thoſe who are beſt ſkilled in *Jewiſh* Antiquities, think that the *Inwards*, or *Fat*. was to be burnt upon the Altar. See *Reland* Antiq. Hebr. p. 383. *Deylingius*, Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. III. p. 332. *Cudworth* on the Lord's Supper, p. 3. fol. Ed.

[n] *Pſalm* L. 12, 13. *Iſa.* i. 11. *Mic.* VI. 6, 7.

[o] See Mr. *Lewis*'s Anſwer to Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 2. 5. 11.

tual

tual Oblation, or *Spiritual* Sacrifice, and nothing elſe. CHAP. XII.

FROM hence may be perceived, how conſiſtent and uniform this early Father was in his *whole* Doctrine on that Head. He expreſſed Himſelf very accurately, when ſpeaking of Spiritual and perfect Sacrifices, He ſaid, that they were what Chriſtians offered *over*, or *upon* the Euchariſtical Commemoration [p]: That is, they *Spiritually* ſacrificed in the *Service* of the Euchariſt. They did not make the *material* Elements *their* Sacrifice, but the *Signs* only of a *greater*. Their *Service* they offered up to God as his *Tribute*; but the *Elements* they took entirely to *Themſelves*. When He ſpeaks of the *Sacrifices of Bread and Wine* [q], He may reaſonably be underſtood to mean, the *Spiritual* Sacrifices of *Lauds*, or of *Charity*, which went along with the ſolemn feaſting upon the *Bread* and *Wine*; and not that the *Elements* themſelves were *Sacrifices* [r]. Upon the whole therefore,

[p] Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρείληφεν ποιεῖν καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει τῆς θυσίας αὐτῶν ἐκείνης τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς —— Dial. p. 387.
Θυσίας —— ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου —— γινομένας. Dial. p. 386.

[q] Περὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, p. 220.

[r] It may be ſuggeſted (See *Johnſon*, Part I. p. 271.) that the Word ἀνάμνησις, *Memorial*, was uſed in relation to the *Shew Bread*, Levit. XXIV. 7. a *Type* of the Euchariſt. But it is obſervable, that the *Shew Bread* was not the Memorial; but the *Incenſe* burnt upon it, That was the *Memorial*, as the Text expreſsly ſays. Now, it is well known, that *Prayers*, *Lauds*, &c. are the *Evangelical Incenſe*, ſucceeding in the Room of the *Legal*: Therefore, to make every Thing correſpond, the *Spiritual* Services of the Euchariſt are properly our *Memorial*, our *Incenſe*, and not the *material* Elements.

I take

CHAP. XII.

I take this bleſſed Martyr to have been conſiſtent throughout in his Doctrine of Spiritual Sacrifices, as being the only Sacrifices preſcribed, or allowed by the Goſpel. And if He judged the Euchariſt to be (as indeed He did) a moſt acceptable Sacrifice, it was becauſe He ſuppoſed it to *comprize* many Sacrifices in one; a right Faith, and clean Heart, and devout Affections, breaking forth in fervent Prayers, Praiſes, and Thankſgivings unto God, and *charitable* Contributions to the Brethren.

Athenagoras may come next, who has not much to our Purpoſe: But yet ſomething He has. He obſerves, that "God needs no *Blood*, "nor *Fat*, nor ſweet *Scents* of Flowers, nor "*Incenſe*, being Himſelf the moſt delightful "*Perfume:* But the nobleſt Sacrifice in his ſight, "is to underſtand his Works and Ways, and to "lift up Holy Hands to Him[r]. A little after He adds, "What ſhould I do with *Burnt-Offer-*"*ings*, which God has no *need* of? But it is "meet to offer Him an *unbloody Sacrifice*, and "to bring Him a *rational Service*[t]." Here we ſee what the proper *Chriſtian* Sacrifices are, namely, the *Spiritual* Sacrifices of devout Prayers, and Obedience of Heart and Life. The *Service* is, with this Writer, the Sacrifice. He takes notice of God's not *needing* Burnt-Offer-

[r] Θυσία αὐτῷ μεγίστη, ἂν γινώσκωμεν τὶς ἐξέτεινε, &c. καὶ ἐπαίρωμεν ἐσίας χεῖρας αὐτῷ. *Athenag.* p. 48, 49. Ed. Oxon.

[t] Τί γὰρ μοι ὁλοκαυτώσεων, ἂν μὴ δεῖ ὁ θεὸς; καὶ τοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν. *Athenag.* P. 49.

ings,

ings, and the like. All *material* Sacrifices conſidered as *Gifts* to God, were apt to inſinuate ſome ſuch Idea to weak Minds: But the *Spiritual* Services do not. In our Euchariſtical Solemnity we conſider not the Elements, when *preſented* before God, as properly *our Gifts* to Him, but as *his Gifts* to us[v]; which, we pray, may be conſecrated to our ſpiritual Uſes. We pay our *Acknowledgments* for them at the ſame time: And that makes one Part, the ſmalleſt Part of our *Spiritual Sacrifice*, or *Service*, in that Solemnity. It may be worth noting, that here in *Athenagoras* we find the firſt mention of *unbloody Sacrifice*, which He makes equivalent to *reaſonable Service:* And He applies it not particularly to the Euchariſt, but to *Spiritual* Sacrifices at large. An Argument, that when it came afterwards to be applied to the Euchariſt, it ſtill carried the ſame Meaning, and was choſen with a View to the *Spiritual* Services contained in it, and not to the *material* Oblation, or Oblations, conſidered as ſuch.

Irenæus, of the ſame Time, will afford us ſtill greater Light, with regard to the Point in hand. He is very large and diffuſe upon the Diſtinction between the *typical* Sacrifices of the *Law*[w], and the *true* Sacrifices of the *Go-*

[v] Hence came the uſual Phraſe, ſo frequent in *Liturgick* Offices, τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δώρων σοι προσφέρομεν, *We preſent unto Thee the Things that are* THINE *out of* THY OWN GIFTS: That is, by way of Acknowledgment. See the Teſtimonies collected in *Deylingius* Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 201. 312.

[w] Per *Sacrificia* autem & reliquas *typicas* obſervantias, putantes propitiari Deum, dicebat eis *Samuel*, &c. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 17. p. 247. Edit. Bened.

ſpel.

CHAP. XII.

ſpel [x]. He ſeems to mean by *typical* there the ſame that St. *Auſtin* before cited, meant by *Signs*. Thoſe external Sacrifices were *Symbols*, *Tokens*, *Pledges* of the *true* Homage, or *true* Sacrifice; which *Irenæus* interprets of a *contrite* Heart, *Faith*, *Obedience*, *Righteouſneſs* [y], &c. referring to ſeveral Texts [z] of the Old Teſtament and New, which recommend true Goodneſs as the acceptable Sacrifice. He underſtands the Goſpel-Incenſe, ſpoken of in *Malachi* [a], of the *Prayers of the Saints* [b], according to *Rev.* V. 8. He makes mention alſo of an *Altar* in *Heaven*, to which the *Prayers* and *Oblations* of the Church are ſuppoſed to aſcend, and on which they are conceived to be offered by our great High-Prieſt to God the Father [c]. The Thought, very probably, was taken from the *Golden Altar* mentioned in the *Apocalypſe* [d], and repreſented as bearing the myſtical Incenſe. The Notion of

[x] *Verum* Sacrificium inſinuans, quod offerentes propitiabuntur Deum, ut ab eo vitam percipiant: Quemadmodum alibi ait; *Sacrificium Deo cor tribulatum*, odor ſuavitatis Deo, cor clarificans eum qui plaſmavit. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 17. p. 248.

[y] Non Sacrificia & Holocauſtomata quærebat ab eis Deus, ſed *Fidem* & *Obedientiam*, & *Juſtitiam*, propter illorum ſalutem. ibid. p. 249.

[z] 1 *Sam* XV. 22. *Pſal.* LI. 17. *Pſal.* L. 14. *Iſa.* I. 16, 17. *Jerem.* VII. 22. 23. *Hoſ.* VI. 6. *Philip.* IV. 18.

[a] *Malach.* I. 11.

[b] *In omni loco Incenſum offertur nomini meo, & Sacrificium purum.* Incenſa autem *Johannes* in Apocalypſi *Orationes eſſe*, ait, *Sanctorum.* Iren. ibid. p. 249.

[c] Eſt ergo *Altare* in *Cœlis* (illic enim preces noſtræ & oblationes diriguntur) & Templum; quemadmodum *Johannes* in Apocalypſi ait, *Et apertum eſt Templum Dei.* Iren. ibid.

[d] *Revel.* VIII. 3. 5. Vid. *Vitringa* in loc. *Dodwell* on Incenſing, p. 39 —— 44.

a *myſti-*

a *myſtical Altar* in Heaven became very frequent in the Chriſtian Writers after *Irenæus* [e], and was in proceſs of Time taken into moſt of the old *Liturgies*, Greek, Latin, and Oriental; as is well known to as many as are at all converſant in them. The Notion was not *new*: For the Old Teſtament ſpeaks of Prayers, as *coming up to God's Holy Dwelling-place, even to Heaven* [f]: And the New Teſtament follows the ſame Figure of Speech, applying it both to *Prayers* and *Alms-Deeds*, in the Caſe of *Cornelius* [g].

CHAP. XII.

Irenæus, as I have obſerved, underſtood the *Incenſe*, mentioned in the Prophet, of the *Evangelical* Sacrifice of *Prayer*: But then it is to be farther noted, that He diſtinguiſhed between the *Incenſe*, and the *pure Offering*, and ſo underſtood the latter of ſomething elſe. He underſtood it of the *Alms* or *Oblations* that went along with the Prayers; referring to St. *Paul*'s Doctrine, in *Phil.* IV. 18. which recommends charitable Contributions, as *an Odour of a ſweet Smell, a Sacrifice acceptable, well-pleaſing to God*; as alſo to *Proverbs* XIX. 17. *He that hath pity upon the Poor, lendeth unto the Lord* [h]. Such were

[e] *Clemens Alex.* p. 209.
Origen. Hom. in Joh. XVII. p. 438.
Gregor. Nazianz. Vol. I. p. 31. 484. 692.
Chryſoſtom. in Hebr. Hom. XI. p. 807.
Cyrill. Alex. de Adorat. L. IX. p. 310.
Apoſtol. Conſtitut. L. VIII. c. 13.
Auguſtin. Serm. 351. de pœnit. p. 1357. Tom. V.

[f] 2 *Chron.* XXX. 27. Compare *Tobit* III. 16. XII. 12. *Wiſd.* IX 8.

[g] *Acts* X. 4.

[h] *Irenæus* L. IV. c. 18. p. 251.

the

CHAP. XII.

the *pure Offerings* of the Church, in *Irenæus*'s Account; and they were *Spiritual* Sacrifices: For it is the *Service*, not the *material* Offering, which God accepts in ſuch Caſes, as *Irenæus* himſelf has plainly intimated [i]. It muſt be owned that *Irenæus* does ſpeak of the Euchariſtical *Oblations* under the Notion of *Preſents* brought to the *Altar*, offered up to *God*, for the agnizing Him as *Creator* of the World, and as the *giver* of all good Things, and for a Teſtimony of our Love and Gratitude towards Him on that Score [k]. This He calls a *pure Sacrifice* [l], *Preſent*, *Offering*, and the like: And ſince the Bread and Wine ſo offered, were certainly *material*, how ſhall we diſtinguiſh the Sacrifice He ſpeaks of from a *material* Sacrifice, or how can we call it a *Spiritual* Sacrifice? A learned Foreigner, being aware of the ſeeming Repugnancy, has endeavoured to recon-

[i] Qui enim nullius indigens eſt Deus, in ſe aſſumit *bonas operationes noſtras*, ad hoc ut præſtet nobis Retributionem bonorum ſuorum. *Iren.* ibid. p. 251.

[k] Suis diſcipulis dans conſilium, *primitias* Deo offerre ex ſuis creaturis, non quaſi *indigenti*, ſed ut ipſi nec *infructuoſi* nec *ingrati* ſint, eum qui ex creatura *panis* eſt accepit, & gratias egit, &c. —— *Novi* Teſtamenti *novam* docuit oblationem, quam Eccleſia ab Apoſtolis accipiens, in univerſo mundo *offert Deo*, ei qui Alimenta nobis præſtat, *primitias* ſuorum munerum in novo Teſtamento, &c. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 17. p 249.

[l] Eccleſiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in univerſo mundo, *purum Sacrificium* reputatum eſt apud Deum, & acceptum eſt ei: Non quod indigeat a nobis *Sacrificium*, ſed quoniam is qui *offert*, glorificatur ipſe in eo quod offert, ſi acceptetur *munus* ejus. Per *munus* enim erga Regem & *Honos* & *Affectio* oſtenditur: Quod in omni ſimplicitate & innocentia Dominus volens nos offerre, prædicavit dicens, *Cum igitur offers munus tuum ad Altare*, &c. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 18. p. 250.

cile

cile the Author to Himſelf, by ſaying, that the Euchariſtical *Oblation* may ſtill be reckoned a *Spiritual Sacrifice*, on account of the *Prayers*, *Lauds*, and *Offerings* going along with it, which are *Spiritual* Services[m]. Another learned Gentleman obſerves, that according to *Irenæus*, the very *Life* and *Soul* of the *new Oblation* reſts in the *Prayers* by which it is offered up, and which *finiſh* or *perfect* the *Spiritual* Oblation[n]. The Solution appears to be *juſt*, ſo far as it goes: But I would take leave to add to it, that the *material Offering*, in this Caſe, is not properly a *Preſent* made to God, tho' brought before Him: For it is not conſumed (like a Burnt-Offering) in God's *immediate* Service, nor any Part of it, but it goes entire to the *uſe* of *Man*, not ſo much as any *Particle* of it ſeparated for *God's Portion*, as in the *Legal* Sacrifices*. Therefore the *material* Offering is not the *Sacrifice*; but the Communicant's *agnizing* the Creator by it; That is properly *Sacrifice*, and *Spiritual* Sacrifice, of the ſame nature with *Lauds*. I

CHAP. XII.

[m] Non ſatis *ſibi conſtare* videtur *Irenæus*, qui de Sacrificiis *Spiritualibus* antea locutus erat, deque iis acceperat vaticinium *Malachiæ*, quod nunc contra ad *Oblationes* iſtas *Euchariſticas* trahere videtur. At bene cuncta ſe habent, ſi obſervemus & ipſam Euchariſtiam ratione *Precum* & *Gratiarum actionis*, quæ eam comitari ſolet, & *Oblationes* quoque iſtas, quas cum Euchariſtia conjungere moris erat, ſuum itidem locum inter *Sacrificia Spiritualia* promereri. *Buddeus*, Miſcellan Sacr. Tom. I. p 59, 60

[n] Ex quibus patet *Animam* oblationis *novæ*, quæ in Nov. Teſt. juxta *Irenæum* fit, & a Chriſto inſtituta eſt, eſſe *Preces* queis dona offeruntur. —— Accedentibus *precibus*, quibus nomen Dei glorificatur, ipſi gratiæ redduntur, donorumque Sanctificatio expetitur, *perficitur* utique *Spiritualis* illa atque Euchariſtica oblatio. *Pfaffius* in Irenæi Fragm. p 57.

* *See above*, p. 207.

CHAP. XII.

may add further, that thoſe Euchariſtical *Oblations* were, in *Irenæus*'s Account, *Contributions* to the *Church* and to the *Poor*, as is plain by his referring to *Prov.* XIX. 17. and *Phil.* IV. 18. which I noted before: And therefore He looked upon them as Evangelical and Spiritual Sacrifices, falling under *Article* the *firſt* of the Recital given above. For it is not the *Matter* of the Contributions which conſtitutes the *Sacrifice*, but it is the *exerciſe* of *Benevolence*, and that is *Spiritual*, and what God accepts. Under the *Law*, God accepted the *external* Sacrifice, the *material* Offering, as to *legal* Effect: But under the Goſpel, He accepts of nothing as to any ſalutary *Effect* at all, but the *Spiritual* Service. This is the *new Oblation*, the only one that is any way acceptable under the Goſpel, being made in *Spirit* and in *Truth*.

SOME perhaps may object, that ſuch *Spiritual* Oblation cannot juſtly be called *new*, ſince it was mentioned by the *Prophets*, and is as old as *David* at leaſt, who ſpeaks of the *Sacrifice* of a *contrite* Heart, and the like[o]. All which is very certain, but foreign to the Point in hand. For, let it be conſidered, 1. That the *new Covenant* is really as old as *Adam*, and yet is juſtly called *new*. 2. That tho' *Spiritual Sacrifices* were always the moſt acceptable Sacrifices, yet God did *accept* even of *material* Sacrifices, under the *Moſaical* Oeconomy, as to *legal* Effect; and ſo it was a *new* Thing to put

[o] See *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 264. alias 268.

an

an end to ſuch *legal* Ordinances. 3. That when *Spiritual* Sacrifices obtained (as they all along did) under the *Law*, yet they obtained under *Veils*, *Covers*, or *Symbols*; and ſo it was a *new* Thing to accept of them, under the Goſpel, ſtripped of all their *Covers*, and *external* Signatures. 4. The Goſpel Sacrifices are offered *in*, *by*, and *thro' Chriſt*, expreſsly and explicitely; and ſo the *Spiritual Sacrifices* of the Goſpel are offered in a *new* way, and under a *new Form* [p]. Theſe conſiderations appear ſufficient to juſtify *Irenæus*'s calling the Chriſtian Oblation a *new Oblation:* Or it may be added, that new *Light*, new *Force*, and new *Degrees* of Perfection have been brought in by the Goſpel to every Part or Branch both of ſpeculative and practical Religion. CHAP. XII.

I PASS on to *Clemens* of *Alexandria*. He maintains conſtantly, under ſome variety of Expreſſion, that *Spiritual* Sacrifices are the only *Chriſtian* Sacrifices. To the Queſtion, What Sacrifice is moſt acceptable to God? He makes

[p] "By Him we are to *offer:* It is his *Merit* and *Mediation* that "crowns the *Sacrifice*. —— This *by Him* gives the *Characteriſtical* "difference of the *Chriſtian Sacrifice* from all others: For, other-"wiſe, the *Sacrifice of Praiſe* was common to all Times before "and under the Law. You find in many Pſalms a *Sacrifice* of "*Praiſe* and *Thankſgiving*, but in none of them *by Him*, in Chriſt's "Name. *Hitherto ye have aſked nothing in my Name*, ſays our Sa-"viour; but hereafter his Name will give Virtue and Efficacy "to all our Services: And therefore, to gain ſo gracious an Ad-"vocate with the Father, our Prayers and Supplications are in "the *Liturgy* offered up in his Name, concluding always, *by the* "*Merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*" Biſhop *Lany*'s Sermon on *Hebr.* XIII. 15. p. 13, 14.

CHAP. XII.

answer, in the words of the Psalmist, *a contrite Heart*. He goes on to say: "How then shall "I *crown*, or *anoint*, or what *Incense* shall I "offer unto the Lord? A *Heart* that glorifies "its Maker, is a *Sacrifice of sweet Odour* unto "God: These are the *Garlands*, and *Sacrifices*, "and *Spices* and *Flowers* for God[q]." In another Place, condemning the Luxury of *Perfumes*, He starts an Objection, *viz.* That Christ our High Priest may be thought perhaps to offer *Incense*, or *Perfumes* above: An Objection grounded probably, either upon what the *typical* High Priest did under the *Law*[r], or upon what is intimated of Christ Himself under the *Gospel*[s]: To which *Clemens* replies, that our Lord offers no such *Perfume* there, but what He does offer above, is the *Spiritual Perfume* of *Charity*[t]. He alluded, as it seems, to our Lord's *Philanthropy*, in giving Himself a *Sacrifice* for Mankind; unless we choose to understand it of our Lord's recommending the *Charity* of his Saints and Servants at the High Altar in Heaven. *Clemens* elsewhere reckons up *Meekness*, *Philanthropy*, exalted *Piety*, *Humility*, *sound Knowledge*, among the acceptable Sacrifices[u], as they amount to sacrificing the *old Man*, with the *Lusts* and Passions: To which he adds also,

[q] *Clemens Alex.* Pedag. Lib. III. cap. 12. p. 306. Conf. *Strom.* Lib. II. p. 369, 370.

[r] *Exod.* XXX. 7.

[s] *Revel.* V. 8. VIII 3. Conf. *Vitring.* in loc.

[t] Τὸ δ' ἀγάπης δεκτὸν ἀναφερεῖν τὸ κύριον, τὴν πνευματικὴν δῶρεάν, εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, &c. *Clem. Alex.* Pedag. Lib. II. cap. 8. p. 209.

[u] *Clem. Alex* Strom. VII. p. 836.

the

the offering up *our own ſelves*; thereby glori- CHAP.
fying Him who was ſacrificed for us. Such XII.
were this Author's Sentiments of the *Chriſtian* Sacrifices: He looked upon the *Church* itſelf as the Altar here below, the collective Body of Chriſtians, ſending up the *Sacrifice* of *Prayer* to Heaven, with united Voices: the *beſt* and *holieſt* Sacrifice of all, if ſent up in *Righteouſneſs*[w]. He ſpeaks ſlightly of the *legal Sacrifices*, as being Symbols only of Evangelical Righteouſneſs[x]. He makes the *juſt Soul* to be a *Holy Altar*[y]: And as to the *Sacrifice of the Church*, it is "Speech *exhaled* from *Holy Souls*, while "the whole Mind is laid open before God, "together with the *Sacrifice*[z]." Elſewhere, the *Sacrifices* of the Chriſtian *Gnoſtick* He makes to be *Prayers*, and *Lauds*, and *reading* of *Scripture*, and *Pſalms*, and *Anthems*[a]. Such were *Clemens*'s general Principles, in relation to Goſpel Sacrifices. He has not directly applied them to the particular Inſtance of the *Euchariſt*; tho' we may reaſonably do it for Him, upon probable preſumption. It is manifeſt that He could not *conſiſtently* own it for a *Sacrifice* of ours, in any other view but as a *Service* carrying in

[w] *Clem. Alex.* Strom. VII. p. 848.

[x] Αἱ μὲν γὰρ κατ' τὸν νόμον θυσίαι, τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἡμᾶς εὐσέβειαν διδασκέτωσαν. *Clem. Alex.* ibid p. 849.

[y] Βωμὸν δὲ ἀληθῶς ἅγιον, τὴν δικαίαν ψυχήν. p. 848. Conf. *Auguſtin.* de Civit. Dei, Lib. X. cap 4.

[z] Ἡ θυσία τῆς ἐκκλησίας, λόγος δι' ὃν τῶν ἁγίων ψυχῶν ἀναθυμιᾶται εὐκαλυπτέρμβλητος, ἅμα τῆς διανοίας ἀπάσης πρὸς θεὸν. *Clem. Alex.* p. 848.

[a] Θυσίαι μὲν αὐτῷ, εὐχαί τε καὶ αἶνοι, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐσιάσεως ἀνεύξεις τῶν γραφῶν, ψαλμοὶ δὲ καὶ ὕμνοι, &c. Strom. VII. p. 860, 861.

CHAP. XII.

it ſuch *Spiritual* Sacrifices as He has mentioned: In that view, it might be upon his Principles a noble Sacrifice, yea a Combination of Sacrifices.

Tertullian may come next, a very conſiderable Writer, who has a great deal to our Purpoſe: I ſhall ſelect what may ſuffice to ſhew his Sentiments of the *Chriſtian Sacrifices*. Giving ſome account of them to the *Pagans*, in his famous *Apology*, He expreſſes Himſelf thus: "I offer unto God a fatter and nobler Sacri-"fice, which Himſelf hath commanded; *viz.* "*Prayer* ſent out from a chaſte Body, an inno-"cent Soul, and a ſanctified Spirit: Not worth-"leſs grains of *Frankincenſe*, the Tears of an "*Arabian* Tree[b]," *&c.* I ſhall only obſerve, that if *Tertullian* had underſtood the material *Elements* of the Euchariſt to be a *Sacrifice*, how eaſy might it have been to retort upon Him the *worthleſs Grains* of Wheat, and the like. But He had no ſuch Thought. *Prayer*, and a *good Life* were his *Sacrifice:* And a noble one They are. In another Place of his Works, He ſays: "We *ſacrifice* indeed, but it is with *pure* "*Prayer*, as God has commanded; for God, "the Creator of the Univerſe, hath *no need* of "any *Incenſe*, or *Blood*[c]." How obvious might

[b] Offero ei opimam & majorem Hoſtiam, quam ipſe mandavit, *Orationem* de Carne *pudica*, de Anima *innocenti*, de Spiritu *Sancto* profectam: Non grana Thuris unius aſſis, Arabicæ Arboris Lacrymas, *&c.* *Tertull.* Apol. cap XXX. p. 277. Edit. Havercamp.

[c] Sacrificamus —— ſed quomodo Deus præcepit, *pura prece:* Non enim egit Deus, conditor univerſitatis, *odoris*, aut Sanguinis alicujus. *Tertull.* ad *Scap.* cap. II. p. 69. Rigalt.

it

it have been to retort, that God has *no need* of *Bread*, or *Wine*, had That been the *Chriſtian Sacrifice:* But *Tertullian* knew better; and ſtill He reſts it upon *pure Prayer*, that is, *Prayer* together with a *good Mind.* Let us hear Him again: "That we ought not to offer unto God "*Earthly* but *Spiritual* Sacrifices, we may learn "from what is written: *The Sacrifice of God* "*is an humble and contrite Spirit:* And elſe- "where; *Offer unto God the Sacrifice of Thankſ-* "*giving, and pay thy Vows unto the moſt High.* "So then, the *Spiritual* Sacrifices of *Praiſe* are "here pointed to, and a *troubled Spirit* is de- "clared to be the acceptable Sacrifice unto "God[d]." What *Juſtin Martyr* rejected as *material* Sacrifice, our Author here rejects under the Name of *earthly* or *terrene.* Are not *Bread*, and *Wine*, both of them *terrene?* Therefore He thought not of them, but of ſomething *Spiritual:* And He has named what; *viz. Lauds* and *Thankſgivings*, and diſcharge of ſacred *Vows*, all from an *humble* and *contrite* Heart: Theſe were the acceptable Sacrifices, in his Account. He goes on, in the ſame Place, to quote *Iſaiah* againſt *Carnal* Sacrifices, and *Malachi* alſo, to ſhew that *Spiritual* Sacrifices are eſtabliſhed[e]. In his Treatiſe againſt *Marcion*, He again refers

CHAP. XII.

[d] Namque, quod non *terrenis* Sacrificiis, ſed *Spiritalibus*, Deo litandum ſit, ita legimus ut ſcriptum eſt: *Cor contribulatum & humiliatum Hoſtia Deo eſt.* Et alibi, *Sacrifica Deo Sacrificium Laudis, & redde Altiſſimo vota tua.* Sic igitur Sacrificia *Spiritalia* laudis deſignantur, & *Cor contribulatum* acceptabile Sacrificium Deo demonſtratur. *Tertull.* adv. *Jud.* cap. V. p. 188.

[e] *Tertull.* adv. *Jud.* cap. V. p. 188.

CHAP. XII.

to the Prophet *Malachi*, interpreting the *pure Offering* there mentioned, not of any *material* Oblation, but of *hearty Prayer from a pure Conſcience*[f]; and elſewhere, of giving *Glory*, and *Bleſſing*, and *Lauds*, and *Hymns**. Which, by the way, may ſerve for a Comment upon *Juſtin* and *Irenæus*, as to their applying that Paſſage of *Malachi* to the *Euchariſt:* They might do it, becauſe the *Spiritual* Sacrifices here mentioned by *Tertullian*, make a great Part of the *Service*. It would have been very improper, to interpret one Part of *Spiritual* Service, *viz.* of *Prayer*, and the other of a *material* Loaf. In another Treatiſe, *Tertullian* numbers up among the acceptable Sacrifices, *Conflicts* of *Soul*, *Faſtings*, *Watchings*, and *Abſtemiouſneſs*, with their *mortifying appurtenances*[g]. But beſides all this, there is, if I miſtake not, in the latter Part of his *Book* of *Prayer* (publiſhed by *Muratorius A. D.* 1713.) a large and full Deſcription of the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice*, which will be worth the tranſcribing at length. After recommending the uſe of *Pſalmody* along with Prayers, and the making *Reſponſes* in the publick Service, He then declares that ſuch kind of *Prayer*, ſo *ſaturated* with Pſalmody, is like a *well fed* Sacrifice: But it is of the *Spiritual* kind, ſuch

[f] *Sacrificium mundum:* ſcilicet ſimplex Oratio de Conſcientia pura. *Tertull.* contra *Marc.* Lib. IV. cap. 1. p. 414.

* *Sacrificium mundum:* Gloriæ ſcilicet Relatio, & Benedictio, & Laus, & Hymni. Adv. *Marc.* Lib III. cap. 22. p. 410.

[g] *Sacrificia Deo grata:* Confligtationes dico Animæ, jejunia, feras & aridas eſcas, & Appendices hujus officii Sordes. De Reſurrect. Carn. cap. VIII. p. 330.

as

as ſucceeded in the room of all the *legal* Sacri- CHAP.
fices. Then referring to *Iſaiah*, Ch. L. 11. to XII.
ſhew the comparative Meanneſs of the *Jewiſh* ~~
Sacrifices, and to *John* IV. 23. for the right underſtanding the *Evangelical*, He proceeds thus: " We are the *true Worſhipers*, and the *true* " *Prieſts*, who worſhiping *in Spirit*, do *in Spi-* " *rit* ſacrifice *Prayer*, ſuitable to God and ac- " ceptable; ſuch as He has required, and ſuch " as He has provided for Himſelf. This is " what we ought to bring to God's Altar [by " way of *Sacrifice*] *devoted* from the whole " Heart, *fed* with Faith, *decked* with Truth, by " Innocence made *entire*, and *clean* by Chaſtity, " *crowned* with a Feaſt of Charity, attended " with a *Train* of good Works, amidſt the Ac- " clamations of *Pſalms* and *Anthems*[h]." The Reader will here obſerve, how the Author moſt elegantly deſcribes the *Chriſtian* and *Spiritual* Sacrifice of *Prayer*, in Phraſes borrowed from

[h] Diligentiores in orando ſubjungere in *orationibus Alleluia* ſolent, & hoc genus *Pſalmos*, quorum clauſulis reſpondeant, qui ſimul ſunt: Et eſt optimum utique Inſtitutum omne, quod proponendo & honorando Deo competit, *ſaturatam* orationem, velut optimam [lege *opimam*] Hoſtiam admovere. Hæc eſt enim *Hoſtia Spiritalis*, quæ priſtina Sacrificia delevit. *Quo mihi*, inquit, *multitudinem Sacrificiorum veſtrorum?* —— Quæ ergo quæſierit Deus, Evangelium docet: *Veniet Hora*, inquit, *cum veri Adoratores* adorabunt Patrem in Spiritu & Veritate: Deus *enim Spiritus eſt*, & Adoratores itaque tales requirit. Nos ſumus veri Adoratores, & veri Sacerdotes, qui Spiritu orantes, Spiritu ſacrificamus orationem Dei propriam, & acceptabilem, quam ſcilicet requiſivit, quam ſibi proſpexit. Hanc de toto corde *devotam*, Fide *paſtam*, Veritate *curatam*, Innocentia *integram*, Caſtitate *mundam*, *Agape coronatam*, cum pompa Bonorum Operum inter *Pſalmos* & *Hymnos* deducere ad *Dei Altare* debemus. *Tertullian.* de Orat. cap. XXVII, XXVIII. pag. 52, 53. Edit. Murator.

material

CHAP. XII.

material Sacrifices; with an *Heifer*, or *Bullock* in his Mind, led up to the *Altar* to be *ſacrificed:* And his *Epithets* are all choſen, as the Editor has juſtly obſerved, ſo as to anſwer that *Figure*[i]. But what I am principally to note is, that this was really intended for a Deſcription of the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice:* Which is plain from the Circumſtances: 1. From his ſpeaking of the publick *Pſalmody*, as going along with it[k], and the *Reſponſes* made by the Aſſembly. 2. From the mention made of *God's Altar*. 3. And principally, from what He ſays of the *Feaſt* of *Charity*, which is known to have been connected with the *Service* of the Euchariſt, or to have been an *Appendage* to it[l], at that Time; for which Reaſon, that Service may very properly be ſaid to have been *crowned* with it. Theſe Circumſtances ſufficiently ſhew, that *Tertullian* had the *Communion-Service* in his Mind, and That was the *Sacrifice* which He there choſe to deſcribe; a complicated Sacrifice, conſiſting of many Articles, and all of them *Spiritual*, but all ſummed up in a *right Faith*, *pure Worſhip*, and *good Life*. Such is the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*; and ſuch we ought to bring conſtantly to the *Lord's Table*, to the holy and *myſtical* Altar.

[i] *Orationi*, quam *Hoſtiam Spiritalem* appellat, ſingula tribuit, quæ victimis *carneis* conveniebant, nimirum ut de toto corde *voveatur* Deo, ut ſit *paſta*, *curata*, *integra*, *munda*, *coronata*. Muratorius in Notis, p. 53.

[k] Quorum clauſulis *reſpondeant*, qui *ſimul* ſunt.

[l] See *Bingham*, Book XV. chap. 7. § 7, 8. *Suicer.* Theſaur. Tom. I. p. 26.

To

To the ſame Purpoſe ſpeaks *Minucius Felix*, not long after *Tertullian*. The only *Gifts* proper to be *offered* to *God* by Chriſtians, are Chriſtian *Services*, Chriſtian *Virtues*, according to his Account[m]. To offer Him any Thing elſe, is *throwing* Him *back* his *own* Gifts, not preſenting Him with any Thing of *ours*. What could *Minucius* therefore have thought of offering Him *Bread* and *Wine*, if conſidered as *Gifts*, or *Sacrifices* to God? It is manifeſt, that He muſt have underſtood the *Service*, not the *Elements*, to be the Chriſtian *Gift*, and Chriſtian *Sacrifice*.

CHAP. XII.

Origen falls in with the Sentiments of the earlier Fathers, as to *Spiritual* Sacrifices, and their being the only Goſpel Sacrifices. For, when *Celſus* had objected to Chriſtians their want of *Altars*, He replies: "The Objector "does not conſider, that, with us, every good "Man's Mind is his *Altar*, from whence truly "and Spiritually the Incenſe of Perfume is "ſent up: *viz. Prayers* from a pure Conſci-"ence[n]." Then He refers to *Rev.* V. 8. and to *Pſalm* CXLI. 2. A little higher up in the ſame Treatiſe, He ſpeaks of Chriſtians preſent-

[m] Hoſtias & victimas Domino offeram, quas in uſum mei protulit, ut rejiciam ei *ſuum munus*? Ingratum eſt: Cum ſit litabilis hoſtia bonus Animus, & pura mens, & ſincera Conſcientia. Igitur, qui *innocentiam* colit, Domino ſupplicat; qui *juſtitiam*, Deo libat; qui fraudibus abſtinet, propitiat Deum; qui hominem periculo ſubripit, opimam victimam cædit. Hæc noſtra *Sacrificia*, hæc Dei *ſacra* ſunt. *Minuc. Fel.* Sect. 32. p. 183.

[n] Οὐκ ὁρῶν, ὅτι βωμοὶ μὲν εἰσιν ἡμῖν τὸ ἑκάστου τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικὸν, ἀφ' οὗ ἀναπέμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς θυμιάματα, αἱ πρόσευχαὶ ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως καθαρᾶς. *Origen* contra *Celſ.* p. 755.

ing

CHAP. XII.

ing their *Petitions*, *Sacrifices*, and *Supplications*; beſeeching Chriſt, ſince *He is the Propitiation for our Sins*, to recommend the ſame in quality of High Prieſt, to the Acceptance of God the Father[o]. We may here obſerve, that the *Altar* which He ſpeaks of, is *Spiritual*, as well as the *Sacrifice*. Had he known of any *material* Altar, or *material* Sacrifice (properly ſo called) among Chriſtians, this was the Place for Him to have named it. It is true, the Lord's Table is often called *Altar* in the ancient Monuments, and it is a *material* Table: And the *Alms* alſo and *Oblations* made at the ſame Table, for the uſe of Church and Poor, are *material*, as well as the Table. But the *Service* is *Spiritual*, and That is the *Sacrifice* there offered: And therefore the *Table*, conſidered as an *Altar*, an Altar for *Spiritual* Sacrifice, is a *myſtical*, *Spiritual* Altar. So if a Man offers his own Body as a *Sacrifice* for the Name of Chriſt upon a *Scaffold*, his Body is *material*, and ſo is the Scaffold alſo: But nevertheleſs, the *Sacrifice* is Spiritual, and the *Scaffold*, conſidered as an *Altar*, muſt be a *Spiritual* Altar, to make it anſwer to the *Sacrifice*, as they are *Correlates*. This I hint by the way, in order to obviate ſome wrong Conſtructions, which have beeen made[p] of a *material* Table, and *material* Elements. It is true, the Table is *mate-*

[o] Ὦ, πρῶτον προσφέρομεν αὐτὰς, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτὸν, ἱλασμὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, προσκαλεῖσθαι ὡς ἀρχιερέα τὰς δεήσεις, καὶ τὰς θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμῶν τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ. p. 751.

[p] See *Johnſon*'s Unbloody Sacrifice, Part I. p. 30. alias 31.

rial,

rial, and the Elements alſo *material*: But ſo far as one is conſidered or called an *Altar*, it is *Spiritual* and *myſtical*; and ſo far as the other are called a *Sacrifice*, they alſo are *Spiritual* and *myſtical*. The Holy Table is called an *Altar*, with regard to the *Spiritual* Services, that is, *Sacrifices* ſent up from it, and ſo it is a *Spiritual* Altar: Then as it bears the *Symbols* of the *Grand Sacrifice* applied in this Service, and herein feaſted upon by every *worthy* Communicant, it is a *Symbolical* or *myſtical* Table, anſwering to the Symbolical and myſtical Banquet. But I paſs on. CHAP. XII.

Cyprian, of that Age, ſpeaks as highly of *Spiritual Sacrifices* as any one before, or after Him. For in an Epiſtle written to the *Confeſſors* in Priſon, and not permitted to *communicate* there, He comforts them up in the manner here following: "Neither your *Religion* nor *Faith* can "ſuffer by the hard Circumſtances you are un- "der, that the *Prieſts* of God have not the li- "berty to *offer* and celebrate the *Holy Sacrifices*. "You do *celebrate*, and you do *offer* unto God "a *Sacrifice* both precious and glorious, and "which will much avail you towards your ob- "taining Heavenly Rewards. The Holy Scrip- "ture ſays: *The Sacrifice of God is a broken Spi- "rit, a broken and a contrite Heart God doth not "deſpiſe*, Pſal. li. 17. This *Sacrifice* you offer "to God, this you celebrate without inter- "miſſion, Day and Night, being made *Victims* "to God, and preſenting *yourſelves* as ſuch, "holy and unblemiſhed, purſuant to the Apo- "ſtle's

CHAP. XII.

" ſtle's Exhortation, where He ſays: *I beſeech*
" *you therefore, Brethren, by the Mercies of God,*
" *that you preſent your Bodies*, &c. Rom. xii. 1.
" For, this is what pleaſes God: And it is this,
" by which our other Services are rendered
" more worthy, for the engaging the Divine
" Acceptance. This is the *only* Thing that our
" devout and dutiful Affections can offer under
" the Name of a *Return* for all his great and
" ſalutary Bleſſings: For, ſo by the *Pſalmiſt*
" ſays the Spirit of God, *what ſhall I render*,
" *&c.* Pſal. cxvi. 12, 13, 15. Who would
" not readily and chearfully take this Cup[q]?"
The Remarks here proper are as follow: 1. That the Author looked upon the Euchariſt as an *Oblation*, or *Sacrifice*, or complication of Sacrifices. 2. That in caſe of injurious Excluſion from it, He conceived that *Spiritual Sacrifices* alone were *equivalent* to it, or more than equivalent to the *ordinary* Sacrifices therein offered. 3. That therefore He could not ſuppoſe any Sacrifice *offered* in the Euchariſt to be the *Archetypal* Sacrifice itſelf, or to be *tantamount* to it: Which I note chiefly in oppoſition to Mr. *Dodwell*, who imagined that the Ancients *reckoned the Chriſtian Euchariſt for the Archetypal Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs*[r]: An Aſſertion, which muſt be very much qualified and ſoftened, to make it tolerable. The Euchariſt, conſidered as a *Sacrament*, is indeed

[q] *Cyprian.* Epiſt. LXXVI. p. 232. Ed. Oxon. alias Epiſt. LXXVII. p. 159. Bened.

[r] *Dodwell* of Incenſe, p. 55.

repre-

repreſentative and exhibitive of the *Archetypal Sacrifice*; not as *offered*, but as *feaſted upon* by us, *given* and *applied* by God and Chriſt to every *worthy* Receiver. Therefore that excellently learned Man inadvertently here confounded the *Sacrificial* view of the Euchariſt with the *Sacramental* one, and *Man*'s Part in it with what is properly *God*'s. What we *give* to God, is our own Service, and *ourſelves*, which is *our* Sacrifice: But the *Archetypal* Sacrifice itſelf is what no one but Chriſt Himſelf could offer, whether *really*, or *Symbolically*. We *repreſent* it, we do not *offer* it in the Euchariſt; but it is is there Sacramentally, or Symbolically to us *exhibited*, or *applied*. 4. It may be noted of *Cyprian*, that He judged the devoting *our whole ſelves* to God's Service and to God's Glory, to be the moſt *acceptable* Sacrifice which *we* are *capable* of offering: And his preferring the Sacrifice of *Martyrdom* (other Circumſtances ſuppoſed equal) to the *ordinary* Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, was conformable to the ſtanding Principles of the Church, in preferring the *Baptiſm* of *Blood* to the *Baptiſm* of *Water*[r].

IT remains to be enquired, in how many Senſes, or upon what Accounts, St. *Cyprian* ſtyled the Euchariſt a *Sacrifice*. 1. He might ſo ſtyle it on account of the *Lay-Offerings* therein made, which were a *Spiritual* Sacrifice[s]. 2. Next, on account of the *Sacerdotal* recom-

[r] Vid. *Dodwell.* Cyprian. Diſſert. XIII. p. 420, &c.
[s] See above, Chap. I. p. 39.

mendation

CHAP. XII.

mendation of the ſame Offerings to the divine Acceptance[u]: Which was another *Spiritual* Sacrifice. 3. On account of the *Prayers*, *Lauds*, *Hymns*, &c. which went along with Both the former, and were *emphatically* Spiritual Sacrifice. 4. On account of the *Chriſtian Charity* and *Brotherly Love* ſignified by, and exemplified in the Service of the Euchariſt: For, That *Cyprian* looked upon as a *prime* Sacrifice of it[w]. 5. On account of the *Grand Sacrifice* applied by Chriſt, commemorated and feaſted on by us (not properly *offered*) in the Euchariſt[x]. Such *Commemoration* is itſelf a *Spiritual* Service, of the ſame Nature with *Lauds*, and ſo makes a Part of the Spiritual *Sacrifice* of the Euchariſt. In theſe ſeveral views, *Cyprian* might, or probably did look upon the Euchariſt as a *Sacrifice*, and accordingly ſo *named* it.

THERE is one particular Paſſage in *Cyprian*, which has been often pleaded by *Romaniſts* in favour of a *real* ſacrificing of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and ſometimes by *Proteſtants*, amongſt ourſelves, in favour of a *material* Sacrifice at

[u] See above, p 39. Pope *Innocent* I clearly expreſſes Both, in theſe Words: De nominibus vero recitandis, antequam Preces Sacerdos faciat, atque *eorum oblationes*, quorum nomina recitanda ſunt, *ſua oratione commendet*, quam ſuperfluum ſit, & ipſe pro tua Prudentia recognoſcis: Ut cujus *Hoſtiam* nec dum Deo *offeras*, ejus ante nomen inſinues, &c. *Harduin.* Concil. Tom. I. p. 997.

[w] Sic nec Sacrificium Deus recipit *diſſidentis* —— Sacrificium Deo *majus*, eſt *Pax noſtra* & fraterna *Concordia*, & de unitate Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti *Plebs adunata*. *Cyprian.* de Orat. pag. 211. Edit. Bened. pag. 150. Oxon.

[x] See above, Chap. I. pag. 37, 38, 39, 48.

leaſt,

leaſt, or of a *Symbolical* Offering up of Chriſt's Body and Blood to God the Father. The Words of *Cyprian* run thus: "If Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord "and God, be the High-prieſt of God the Fa- "ther, and firſt offered *Himſelf* a Sacrifice to the "Father, and commanded *This* to be done in "Commemoration of Himſelf; then that Prieſt "truly acts in Chriſt's ſtead, who imitates what "Chriſt did, and then *offers* a *true* and *com-* "*pleat* Sacrifice in the Church to God the Fa- "ther, if He begins *ſo to offer*, as He ſees Chriſt "to have offered before[y]." From hence it has been pleaded, that Chriſt offered Himſelf *in the Euchariſt*, and that the Chriſtian Prieſts ought to *do the ſame* that He did; that is, to *offer*, or Sacrifice *Chriſt Himſelf* in this Sacrament. But it is not certain, that *Cyprian* did mean (as He has not plainly ſaid) that Chriſt offered Himſelf *in the Euchariſt:* He might mean only, that Chriſt offered Himſelf *upon the Croſs*, and that He inſtituted this Sacrament as a *Commemoration* of it. As to the Words *true* and *compleat* Sacrifice, He certainly meant no more, than that Chriſt offered both *Bread* and *Wine*, and had left it us in charge to *do the ſame:* And this He obſerved in Oppoſition to ſome of that Time, who affected to *mutilate*

CHAP. XII.

[y] Si Jeſus Chriſtus, Dominus & Deus noſter, ipſe eſt ſummus Sacerdos Dei Patris, & *Sacrificium* Patri *ſeipſum* primus obtulit, & *Hoc* fieri in ſui commemorationem præcepit; utique ille Sacerdos vice Chriſti verè fungitur, qui id, *quod Chriſtus fecit*, imitatur, & Sacrificium *verum* & *plenum* tunc offert in eccleſia Deo Patri, ſi ſic incipiat *offerre* ſecundum quod ipſum Chriſtum videat obtuliſſe. *Cyprian.* Ep. 63. p. 609. And ſee above, Ch. I. p. 48.

CHAP. XII.

the Sacrament by leaving out the *Wine*, and uſing *Water* inſtead of it, which was not *doing the ſame* that Chriſt did.

HOWEVER, I think it not material to diſpute whether *Cyprian* really intended to teach, that our Lord offered Himſelf *in the Euchariſt*, ſince it is certain, that ſome Fathers of eminent note in the Church, after his Days, did plainly and in Terms affirm it [z]: And other *Fathers* admitted of our Lord's *offering*, or *devoting* Himſelf *previouſly* to the Paſſion [a]. And They are therein followed by ſeveral learned *Moderns*, even among *Proteſtants* [b]; who ground the Doctrine chiefly on *John* XVII. 19. A ſufficient Anſwer to the Objection (ſo far as concerns the *Romiſh* Plea built thereupon) is given by our incomparable Biſhop *Jewell*, in theſe Words: " We deny not but it may well be ſaid, Chriſt " *at his laſt Supper* offered up Himſelf unto his " Father: Albeit, not *really* and *indeed*, but in

[z] *Hilarius*, in Matt. c. 31. p. 743. Ed Bened.
Ambroſius, de Myſter. Paſchæ, c. 1.
Gregor. Nyſſen. de Reſurr. Chriſti, ſeu Paſch. I.
Heſychius in Levit. p. 55, 56. Conf. 169. 376. 540.
Conf. *Steph.* Gobar. apud Phot. Cod. 232. p. 902. *Miſſal. Gotho-Gallican.* p. 297. & *Mabillon.* in Præfat. & alibi.

[a] *Chryſoſtom.* in Johan. Hom. 82. p. 484. *Cyril.* Alex. de Adorat. L. X. p. 350. In Johan. L. IV. c. 2. p. 354.

[b] *Mede* opp. p. 14 *Outram* de Sacrif. p 307. 370. *Witſius*, Miſcellan. Sacr. Tom. I. Diſſert. 2. n. 87. In Symb. Apoſt. Exercit. X. p. 147. *Whitby* on *John* XVII. 19. *Zornius*, Opuſc. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 251. *Deylingius*, Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 560. *Johnſon's* Unbl. Sacrif. Part I. p. 61 —— 96. Part II. p. 4 —— 10.
N. B. Theſe Authors ſuppoſe that our Lord *devoted* Himſelf beforehand, *gave* Himſelf on the Croſs, *preſented* Himſelf *in* Heaven: *One continued Oblation* in all, but diſtinguiſhed into *three* ſeveral Parts, Views, or Stages.

" a *Fi-*

" a *Figure*, or in a *Myſtery*; in ſuch ſort as we " ſay, Chriſt was offered in the *Sacrifices* of " the *old Law*, and, as St. *John* ſays, *The Lamb* " was *ſlain from the Beginning of the World*. As " Chriſt was *ſlain* at the *Table*, ſo was He *ſa-* " *crificed* at the *Table:* But He was not ſlain " at the Table *verily* and *indeed*, but only in a " *Myſtery*[c]." This is a juſt and full Anſwer to the *Romaniſts*, with whom the good Biſhop held the Debate. But it may ſtill be pleaded by Thoſe who maintain a *material* Sacrifice, that this Anſwer affects not *Them*, ſince they contend only, that Chriſt offered the *Symbols* in the Euchariſt, and *Himſelf* under thoſe Symbols, that is, in a *Myſtery*; juſt as a Man offers to God *Houſes* or *Lands*, by preſenting a *Sword*, or *Piece* of *Money*, or *Pair* of *Gloves* upon the Altar of a Church, or transfers an Eſtate by delivery of *Parchments*, and the like: And if Chriſt thus *Symbolically* offered Himſelf a Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, why may He not be, in like manner, *Symbolically* offered in the Euchariſt, at this Day[d]? This, I think, is the Sum and Subſtance of what is pleaded by ſome *Proteſtants* in favour of a Symbolical *Sacrifice*, as offered in the Euchariſt. To which I anſwer: 1. That no one has any Authority or Right to offer Chriſt as a Sacrifice (whether *really*, or *ſymbolically*) but Chriſt Himſelf. Such a Sacrifice is *his* Sacrifice, not *ours*; offered *for us*, and not *by us*, to God the Father. If Chriſt in the

[c] *Jewell*, Anſw. to *Harding*, p. 417. Compare 426, 427.

[d] See *Johnſon's* Collection of *Saxon* Laws, &c. Pref. p. 57, &c.

CHAP. XII.

Inſtitution offered *Himſelf* under thoſe *Symbols* (which however does not appear [e]) He might have a *right* to do it: We have *none*, and ſo can only *commemorate* what He did, and by the ſame *Symbols*. 2. If we *Symbolically* Sacrifice any Thing in the Euchariſt, it is only in ſuch a Senſe as St. *Auſtin* (hereafter to be quoted) ſpeaks of; where He conſiders the *Bread* and *Wine* as Symbols of the *united Body* of the Church. We may ſo Symbolically offer up, or Sacrifice *ourſelves*, and That is all: More than That, cannot comport with *Scripture*, or with the Principle of the *Ancients*, that all our Sacrifices are made *in* and *by* Chriſt. He is not the *Matter* or *Subject* of our Sacrifices, but the *Mediator* of them: We offer not *Him*, but we offer, what we do offer, *by Him* [f]. 3. If the Thing Symbolically offered in the Euchariſt were *Chriſt Himſelf*, then the *Offerer* or *Offerers* muſt ſtand in the Place of Chriſt, and be as truly the *Symbols* of Chriſt in their *offering* Capacity, as the Elements are ſuppoſed to be in their *Sacrificial* Capacity. Then not only the *Prieſts*, but the *whole Church*, celebrating the Euchariſt, muſt *Symbolically* repreſent the Perſon of Chriſt, and ſtand in his ſtead: A Notion which has no Countenance in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, but is plainly

[e] Vid. *Sam. Baſnag.* Annal. Tom. I. p. 371, 372.

[f] *Hebr.* XIII. 15. Per Jeſum Chriſtum offert Eccleſia. —— Non receperunt verbum *per quod* offertur Deo. *Iren.* L. IV. c. 17, 18. p. 249. 251. Ed. Bened. πῦ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ, ἀφ' ᾧ πάντων ἀνωλάτρει Αρχιερέως αὐτῦ δεδιδάγμεθα. *Euſeb.* Dem. Evang. L. I. c. 10. p. 39. Conf. *Auguſtin.* de Civ. Dei, L. X. c. 20. *Apoſtol.* Conſt. L. II. c. 25. p. 240, 241.

contra-

contradicted by the whole Turn and Tenour of all the ancient *Liturgies*, as well as by the plain Nature and Reaſon of the Thing. 4. I may add laſtly, that all the Confuſion, in this Article, ſeems to ariſe from the want of diſtinguiſhing the *Sacrificial* Part of the Euchariſt from the *Sacramental* one, as before noted: We do not *offer Chriſt to God* in the Euchariſt, but God *offers Chriſt to us*, in return for our offering *ourſelves*. We *commemorate* the Grand Sacrifice, but do not *reiterate* it; no not ſo much as under *Symbols*. But God applies it by thoſe *Symbols*, or *Pledges*: And ſo, tho' there is no *Symbolical* Sacrifice of that kind, neither can be; yet there is a *Symbolical Grant*, and a *Symbolical Banquet*, which is far better, and which moſt effectually anſwers all Purpoſes. In ſhort, there is, as the Apoſtle aſſures us, a *Communion* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, in the Euchariſt, to every *worthy* Receiver. The real and natural Body is, as it were, under *Symbols* and *Pledges*, conveyed to us here, where the *Verity* is not: But to talk of our ſending the ſame up thither, under the like *Pledges*, where the *Verity* itſelf is, carries no Appearance of Truth or Conſiſtency; neither hath it any Countenance either in Scripture, or Antiquity.

CHAP. XII.

I NOW go on to *Lactantius*, who is ſuppoſed to have flouriſhed about *A. D.* 318. The *Chriſtian Sacrifices* which He ſpeaks of, are *Meekheartedneſs*, *innocent Life*, and good Works. He allows of no Sacrifices but of the *incorporeal inviſible* kind, being that ſuch only are fit for *God*,

CHAP. XII.

who is incorporeal and inviſible, to receive, under the laſt and moſt perfect Diſpenſation of the Goſpel. He diſtinguiſhes between *Gifts* and *Sacrifices*, becauſe the Pagans had ſo diſtinguiſhed: But in the laſt Reſult, He lays no Streſs upon that Diſtinction, indifferently reckoning a *good Life*, either as a *Gift*, or a *Sacrifice*. However, where He ſeems at all to diſtinguiſh, He chooſes to make *Integrity* the *Gift*, and ſuch an one as ſhall continue *for ever*; while He appropriates the Name of *Sacrifice*, emphatically ſo uſed, to *Lauds*, *Hymns*, and the like, which He ſuppoſes are appointed *for a Time* only [g].

WE may now come down to *Euſebius*, of the ſame Century, a Man of infinite reading, and particularly converſant in *Chriſtian Antiquities*. He ſpeaks of "the *venerable Sacrifices of* "*Chriſt's Table*, by which officiating, we are "taught to offer up to God ſupreme, during "our whole Lives, the *unbloody*, *ſpiritual*, and "to Him moſt *acceptable* Sacrifices, thro' the "High-prieſt of his, who is above all [h]." For

[g] Quiſquis igitur his omnibus præceptis cœleſtibus obtemperaverit, Hic cultor eſt veri Dei, cujus *Sacrificia* ſunt *manſuetudo Animi*, & *Vita innocens*, & *Actus boni*. ——— Duo ſunt quæ offerri debeant, *donum*, & *Sacrificium*: Donum *in perpetuum*, Sacrificium *ad Tempus*. ——— Deo utrumque *incorporale* offerendum eſt, quo utitur. *Donum* eſt Integritas Animi, *Sacrificium* Laus & Hymnus. Si enim Deus *non videtur*, ergo his rebus coli debet, quæ *non videntur*. ——— Summus igitur colendi Dei Ritus eſt, ex ore juſti Hominis ad Deum directa Laudatio. *Lactant.* De vero cultu, L. VI. c. 24, 25.

[h] Τὰ σεμνὰ τ Χριστ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ὧν καλλιερ ντες, τὰς ἀναίμους κ λογικὰς, αὐτ τ τ προσηνεῖς θυσίας, ἀφ' παν ὸς βί, τ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν θε, ἀφ' ὧν πάντων ἀνωλάτ ἀρχιερέως αὐτ θεδ. ἀγ.θα. *Euſeb.* Dem. Evang. L. I. c. 10. p. 39.

the

the clearer underſtanding of what He meant by the *unbloody*, *ſpiritual* Sacrifices, let Him explain Himſelf in the ſame Page, where He ſays: "The Prophetick Oracles make mention of "theſe *incorporeal* and *ſpiritual* Sacrifices: *Offer* "*unto God the Sacrifice of Praiſe, and pay thy* "*Vows unto the moſt High*—and again, *The* "*Sacrifice of God is a contrite Spirit*[i]," &c. Hence it is manifeſt, that *Euſebius* did not mean by *Sacrifices* the ſacred *Symbols*, which are *corporeal*, but the *ſpiritual* Services of *Prayers*, *Praiſes*, and a *contrite* Heart, as He expreſsly mentions. Which will appear ſtill the plainer, by his quoting, ſoon after, the noted Place of *Malachi*, and expounding both the *Incenſe* and *pure Offering*, of *Prayers* and *Praiſes*. His Comment is worth the reciting: "We offer therefore to "God ſupreme the *Sacrifice* of *Praiſe*: We of- "fer the holy, the venerable Sacrifice, which "hath a decorous Sanctity: We offer after a "*new* way, according to the *New* Teſtament, "the *pure Sacrifice*: For the Sacrifice to God "is ſaid to be a *contrite Spirit*[k]." He goes on to ſum up all in very ſtrong and remarkable Words, as here follows: "Therefore we offer

CHAP. XII.

[i] Ταύτας ἢ πάλιν τὰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ νοερὰς θυσίας τὰ προφητικὰ κηρύττει λόγια ——— θῦσον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, καὶ ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχάς σου ——— καὶ πάλιν, θυσία τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον. *Euſeb.* ibid. p. 39.

[k] Θύομεν οὖν τοιγαροῦν τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως· θύομεν τὸ εὔθεον, καὶ σεμνὸν, καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς θῦμα· θύομεν καινῶς καὶ τὸ καινὸν ἀληθέστερον, τὸ καθαρὸν θυσίαν· θυσία ἢ τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον εἴρηται. *Euſeb.* ibid. p. 40. Conf. c. VI. p. 19, 20, 21. & in *Pſalm.* p. 212.

CHAP. XII.

" both *Sacrifice* and *Incenſe:* Firſt, celebrating " the *Memorial* of the *grand Sacrifice* by thoſe " Myſteries which He has ordained, and pre- " ſenting our Thankſgivings for our Salvation, " by devout Hymns and Prayers. Next, we " offer up *ourſelves* to Him, and to the *Lo-* " *gos* his High-prieſt, reſting upon Him both " with Body and Soul. Whereupon we en- " deavour to preſerve to Him our *Bodies* pure " and untainted from all Filthineſs, and to bring " Him *Minds* free from all evil Affection and " Stain of Maliciouſneſs, and take care to ho- " nour Him by Purity of Thought, Since- " rity of Affection, and Soundneſs of Princi- " ples; for Theſe, we are taught, are more " acceptable to Him than a Multitude of Sa- " crifices, ſtreaming with Blood, and Smoke, " and Nidor[l]."

THIS is an admirable Deſcription of the *Euchariſtical Solemnity* of the *Sacrifices* contained in it, and of the *Ends* and *Uſes* of it, and likewiſe of the *Preparation* proper for it. But my preſent concern is only with the *Sacrificial* View of it. *Euſebius* here takes notice, in the firſt Place, of the *Grand Sacrifice:* Which is no Sacrifice of *ours*, but we make a *Memorial* of it; and That very Memorial is indeed an Article of Spiritual *Service*, and ſo of courſe makes a Part of our *own* Spiritual Sacrifice in the Euchariſt[m]. The reſt is made up of ſuch other

[l] *Euſeb.* Demonſtr. Evang. L. I. c. X. p. 40.

[m] I obſerved above, p. 491. that the Legal *Incenſe* was a *Memorial*, and it was burnt over the *Shew-Bread*, Lev. XXIV. 7. In *Sacri-*

Sacrifices as the Author has there handſomely enumerated. I ſhall only obſerve farther of *Euſebius*, for the cutting off all poſſible Cavils about his meaning, that in another Work of his, He expreſsly teaches, that the *unbloody Sacrifices* will be offered to God, not only in *this Life preſent*, but alſo *in the Life to come* [n]. Certainly, He could not intend it of the Euchariſtick *Symbols*, but of ſomething elſe. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* has followed Him in the ſame Thought, where He ſuppoſes the *Angels* to offer the *unbloody* Sacrifices [o].

CHAP. XII.

WERE I now to go on to other Fathers, down to the Sixth Century, or farther, it might be tedious to the Reader: But They will all be found conſtant and uniform in one Tenour of Doctrine, rejecting all *material*, *corporeal*, *terrene*, *ſenſible* Sacrifices, and admitting none but *Spiritual*, ſuch as I have mentioned. Neither is there any Difference concerning That

like manner, our *commemorative Service* is offered up to God *over* the Elements, and is part of our *Goſpel-incenſe*, conſiſting of *Prayers*, *Lauds*, *Self-humiliation*, *&c.*

[n] Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ἢ αἰῶνι, τὰ λογικὰ δῶρα καὶ τὰς ἀναιμάκτους τῷ θεῷ θυσίας ἀναπέμπων ὁ ἀφθαλμιπάνσοφος ὁ δηλωθεὶς λαός. *Euſeb.* in *Heſai.* 18. p. 427.

[o] *Cyrill. Alexandr.* de Recta Fide, p. 160. N. B. The learned Author of *Unbloody Sacrifice* once thought, that mere Spiritual Sacrifices were never called *unbloody:* But He found afterwards that *Prayers* had that Epithet given them by *Conſtantine*. Apud Sozom. L. II. c 15. He might have added *Greg. Nyſſen.* de Pœnit. p. 170. As to this Place of *Cyril*, He ſuppoſes it meant of *offering* Chriſt's *Body* in Heaven. *Addend.* to Part I. in Part II. p. 266. A ſtrange Thought! eſpecially conſidering that *Angels* are ſuppoſed by *Cyril* to be the Offerers. Compare what *Lactantius* ſays above of *Gifts*, as continuing *for ever*, meaning the Tribute of *Homage*, *&c.* and ſo all is clear.

Point

CHAP. XII.

Point between *Juſtin* of the Second, and *Cyril* of the fifth Century, but that the latter is more full and expreſs for the ſame Thing. However, I ſhall go on a little farther, making choice of a few Teſtimonies, appearing moſt conſiderable either for their *weight*, or their *accuracy*. I paſs over *Hilary*, and *Baſil* with bare References to the Pages [p]: But *Gregory Nazianzen* may deſerve our more eſpecial notice. He was eminently called *The Divine*, for his exactneſs of *Judgment*, and his conſummate Knowledge in *Theology*; and He has ſome remarkable Paſſages, very appoſite to our preſent Purpoſe. About the Year 379, putting the Caſe, that poſſibly, thro' the Iniquity of the Times, He might be driven from the *Altar*, and debarred the Benefit of the Euchariſt, He comforts Himſelf thus: "Will They drive me from the *Al-*
"*tars?* But I know, there is another *Altar*,
"whereof theſe viſible ones are but the *Figures*,
"*&c.*—To That will I preſent myſelf, there
"will I offer the *acceptable* Services, *Sacrifice*,
"*Oblation*, and *Holocauſts*, preferable to Thoſe
"now offered, as much as *Truth* is prefera-
"ble to *Shadow*. —— From this *Altar*, no
"one, who has ever ſo much a Mind to it,
"ſhall be able to debar me [q]." Here we may

[p] *Hilarius*, p. 154. 228. 534, 535. Edit. Bened.
Baſil. Tom. III. p. 52. 207. Edit. Bened.

[q] Θυσιαστηρίων εἴρξουσιν; ἀλλ' οἶδα κἀλλο θυσιαστήριον, ὃ τύπος τὰ νῦν ὁρώμενα τούτῳ —— προσέσομαι, τούτῳ θύσω δεκτὰ, θυσίαν, καὶ προσφοράν, καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα, κρείττονα τὰ νῦν παρεισαγομένων, ὅσῳ κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια. —— τοῦτο μὲ οὖν ἀποξύλ με τὸ θυσιαστήριον πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος. *Gregor. Nazianz.* Orat. XXVIII. p. 484. Confer. *Albertinus*, p. 474.

obſerve,

obſerve, how *Nazianzen* prefers the *ſpiritual* CHAP. *Sacrifices* even before the *Sacrifice* of the *Altar*, XII. externally conſidered. A plain Argument, that He did not look upon it as the *Archetypal Sacrifice*: For, if He had, He could never have been ſo preſumptuous, or profane, as to prefer any Sacrifice of his *own* to the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*. He looked upon the Euchariſtical Sacrifice, *externally* conſidered, and in its *repreſentative*, *commemorative* View, to be no more than the *Figure* of the *Archetypal*, and a *Sign* of the ſpiritual Sacrifices: Therefore He juſtly preferred the *Subſtance* before *Shadows*, and the real Sacrifice of the Heart, before the *outward* Symbols[r]; the offering of which, was not *ſacrificing* at all, but *repreſenting* a Sacrifice, or Sacrifices.

There is another Paſſage of *Nazianzen*, worth the reciting; and ſo I ſhall throw it in here, with ſome proper Remarks upon it. He had been ſetting forth the *Dignity* and *Danger* of the Sacerdotal Function, which for ſome Time, He had ſtudiouſly declined; and among other Conſiderations, He urges one, drawn from the weighty concern of well-adminiſtring the *Holy Communion*, as here follows: "Knowing that "no Man is worthy of the great *God*, and *Sa*- "*crifice*, and *High-prieſt*, who has not firſt pre-

[r] Hence it may be obſerved, that the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice* began to be more and more confined to one *particular* meaning, and to be underſtood in a *narrow* Senſe, as denoting the *Repreſentation* of a Sacrifice: Otherwiſe, there would have been no room for *Nazianzen*'s preferring one to another; for it would have been oppoſing *Spiritual* Sacrifice to *Spiritual*, and would not have anſwered.

"ſented

CHAP. XII.

" ſented *Himſelf* a living *holy Sacrifice* unto God,
" and exhibited the *rational acceptable* Service,
" and offered to God *The Sacrifice of Praiſe*, and
" the *contrite Spirit* (which is the only Sacrifice
" that God, who giveth all Things, demands
" from us back again) how ſhall I dare to offer
" Him the *external* Sacrifice, the *Antitype* of the
" great Myſteries? or how ſhall I take upon me
" the Character or Title of a Prieſt, before I have
" purified my Hands with Holy Works[r]?" Here it may be noted. 1. That the Author diſtinguiſhes very carefully between the *external* Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, and the *internal*, between the *Symbolical* and the *real*. 2. That He did not judge the *external* Sacrifice to be *really* a Sacrifice, or to be more than *nominal*, ſince He oppoſes it to the *real*, *internal* Sacrifices, judging them to be the *only Sacrifices* required. 3. That He judged the *external* Sacrifice to be the *Sign*, *Symbol*, or *Figure*[t] of a true Sacrifice *(viz.* of the *grand Sacrifice)* improperly or figuratively called a Sacrifice, by a *metonymy* of the *Sign*, for the *Thing ſignified*[v]. 4. That ſuch *external*, *nominal* Sacrifice has alſo the Name

[r] Ταῦτα ἂν εἰδὼς ἐγὼ, καὶ ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄξιος μεγάλου, καὶ θεοῦ, καὶ θύματος, καὶ ἀρχιερέως, ὅστις μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ θεῷ θυτίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, μηδὲ ἔθυσε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον (ἣν μόνον ὁ πάντα δεὶς ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν θυσίαν) πῶς ἔμελλον θαῤῥῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὸ ἔξωθεν, τὸ τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον; ἢ πῶς ἱερέως χεῖρας καὶ ὄνομα ὑποδύεσθαι, πρὶν ὁσίοις ἔργοις τελειῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας; Greg. Nazianz. Orat. I. p. 38.

[t] This is intimated by the Word ἀντίτυπον. Conf. Orat. XI. p. 187. Orat. XVII. p. 273. of which Word ſee *Albertinus*, p. 273 — 280. *Pfaffius* p. 131 —— 145.

[v] Vid. *Suicer.* Theſaur. Tom. I. p. 1423, 1424.

of

of *Oblation* [w], in the ſame figurative, metony- CHAP.
mical way, as it was *preſenting* to God the XII.
Signs and *Symbols* of the Body broken, and Blood ſhed, and pleading the Merits of the *Paſſion* there *repreſented*. 5. That the Name of *rational* or *ſpiritual* Service, borrowed from St. *Paul* [x], is not a Name for the *external* Sacrifice, in our Author, but for the *internal* of *Prayers*, *Praiſes*, *contrite Heart*, &c. 6. That the *external* Sacrifice (being the ſame with the *Memorial*) if conſidered as more than *vocal*, and making a Part of the *Thankſgiving* Service, may be juſtly reputed a Sacrifice of the *Spiritual* kind, falling under the Head of *Sacrifice of Praiſe*. 7. That the *Spiritual Sacrifices*, whether conſidered as *previous* Qualifications, or *preſent* Services of Prieſts and People, were thought to be the *only* true and proper Sacrifices *performed* [y]

[w] Intimated in the Word προσφέρειν. Conf. *Cyrill. Hieroſol.* Myſt. V. c. 9. p. 328.

" Chriſt is, in ſome Senſe *offered up to God* by every Commu-
" nicant in the Sacrament, when He does mentally and inter-
" nally *offer* Him to God, and *preſent*, as it were, his bleeding
" Saviour to his *Father*, and deſire him for his Sake to be mer-
" ciful to Him, and forgive Him his Sins. This *internal Obla-*
" *tion* of Chriſt and his *Paſſion* is made by every *Faithful Chri-*
" *ſtian*, *&c.*——— The *Miniſter* alſo — does *offer*, as it were,
" *Jeſus Chriſt* and his *Sacrifice* for the People, *&c.* Dr. *Payne*'s Diſc. on the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *A. D.* 1688. p. 52, 53. Compare Abp. *Sharpe*, Vol. VII. Serm. XI. p. 251. And *Deylingius*, Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 315. And *Pfaffius*, who ſays, This no *Proteſtants* deny, p. 106. 314. 344. ——— The *Oblation*, in this View, is but another Name for *Commemoration*; as I have often noted before.

[x] *Rom.* XII. 1. λογικὴ λατρεία.

[y] I ſay, *performed:* There is another Sacrifice *repreſented*, *commemorated*, which was *performed* 1700 Years ago upon the Croſs.

in

CHAP. XII.

in the Euchariſt: And therefore ſo far as it is itſelf a *Sacrifice*, and not barely a *Sign* of a former Sacrifice, it is a *Spiritual* Sacrifice. 8. Thoſe *Spiritual* Sacrifices were believed *eſſential* to the Euchariſt, conſidered either as a *Sacrifice*, or a *ſalutary Sacrament*: For, without ſuch *Spiritual* Sacrifices, there was no *Sacrifice* performed at all, but a *Repreſentation* of a Sacrifice[z]; and not of *ours*, but of our *Lord's*. And tho' the Euchariſt would ſtill be a *Sacrament* (not a *Sacrifice*) yet it could not be *ſalutary* either to Adminiſtrator, or Receiver, for want of the *Spiritual Sacrifices*, to give it Life and Efficacy; as is here ſufficiently intimated by *Nazianzen*.

THERE is a Commentary upon *Iſaiah*, which has been aſcribed to St. *Baſil* by Critics of the firſt Rate, but yet is probably rejected, as none of his, by the laſt learned *Editor* of *Baſil's* Works; who allows it however to be an uſeful Piece, and as early as the *fourth* Century, or thereabout. What I mention Him for is, that inſtead of all the *Legal* Sacrifices, He admits of *two* only, under the Goſpel; Our *Lord's* upon the Croſs, and *ours*, which conſiſts in every Man's offering his *own ſelf*[a]. There is another Author who has commonly gone under the Name of St. *Chryſoſtom*, but is now rejected

[z] Hujus Sacrificii caro & ſanguis ante Adventum Chriſti per victimas ſimilitudinum promittebatur: In Paſſione Chriſti per ipſam veritatem reddebatur: Poſt Aſcenſum Chriſti per *Sacramentum Memoriæ* celebratur. *Auguſtin.* contr. *Fauſt.* L. XX. c. 21. p. 348. Tom. VIII. Edit. Bened.

[a] *Pſeudo Baſil.* in Iſa. p. 398, &c. Tom. I. Bened. Edit.

as

as ſpurious, who divides the *Sacrifices* of the *Goſpel* after the ſame way: Only the latter of the two He ſubdivides into *nine*, and ſo makes *ten* in all [b], and all of the *Spiritual* kind. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* has a great many Things very clear and expreſs to our preſent Purpoſe [c]: But there is one particular Paſſage in his Xth Book againſt *Julian*, which is ſo *plain*, and ſo full for *Spiritual* Sacrifices, in oppoſition to all *material*, or *corporeal* Sacrifices whatſoever, that nothing can be more ſo. Comparing the Sacrifices of *Chriſtians* with thoſe of the *Jews*, He writes thus: "We Sacrifice now much better "than They of old did: For here deſcendeth "from Heaven, not any *ſenſible Fire* for a "*Symbol* of the ineffable Nature, but the *Holy* "*Spirit* Himſelf, from the Father by the Son, "*enlightening* the Church, and receiving our "*Sacrifices*, namely, the *Spiritual* and *mental* "ones. The *Iſraelites* offered up to God Bul-"locks and Sheep, Turtles and Pigeons; yea "and *Firſt Fruits* of the Earth, *Fine Flour* with "*Oyl* poured upon it, *Cakes*, and *Frankincenſe*: "But we, diſcarding all ſuch *groſs Service*, are "commanded to perform one that is *fine* and "*abſtracted*, *Intellectual* and *Spiritual*. For we "offer up to God, for a ſweet-ſmelling Sa-"vour, all kinds of Virtues, *Faith*, *Hope*, *Chari-*"*ty*, *Righteouſneſs*, *Temperance* [d]," *&c.* Here it

CHAP. XII.

[b] *Pſeudo Chryſoſtom.* in Pſal. 95. p. 631. inter ſpuria, Edit. Bened. Tom. V.

[c] *Cyril. Alex.* contr. *Julian.* L. IX. p. 307, 308. Comment in *Iſa.* L. I. Orat. I. p. 14, 15. In *Malach.* I. 11. p. 830.

[d] *Cyrill. Alex.* contr. Jul. L. X. p. 345.

is

CHA XII.

is to be noted, that *Cyril* rejects abſolutely *all* corporeal Sacrifices, and not only the *bloody* ones of *Bulls* and *Goats*, and the like. He oppoſes the Chriſtian *mental* Sacrifices to the Sacrifices of *fine Flour*, and *Cakes*, and other ſuch *groſs* and *ſenſible* Sacrifices. How could He do this, if He thought the *Elements* of the Euchariſt were a *Sacrifice* or *Sacrifices?* Are *Bread* and *Wine* at all leſs *groſs*, or leſs *ſenſible*, than *fine Flour*, *Cakes*, and *Oyl*, and other *Fruits* of the Earth? Or have they any other claim to the Name of *mental* and *ſpiritual* Sacrifices, than the other alſo might juſtly have? Therefore it is plain, that *Cyril* never admitted the *material* Elements of the Euchariſt, as any Part of the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*; but the *ſpiritual Service* performed in it, That was the Sacrifice. The *material* Elements were *Signs* and *Symbols* of our *Lord's Sacrifice*, not *the Sacrifice* itſelf, nor *any Sacrifice* at all, in ſtrict Propriety of Speech: For, our *own proper* Sacrifice, as diſtinct from our *Lord's*, are our own *Services* of *Prayer* and *Praiſe*, of *Faith*, and of a *good Life*. Such is the conſtant Doctrine of all Antiquity.

I SHALL cloſe this Account with the Sentiments of the great St. *Auſtin*. His Treatiſe *De Civitate Dei* may be called his Maſter-piece, being his moſt learned, moſt correct, and moſt elaborate Work; which lay upon his Hands 13 Years, from 413 to 426: He died in 431. Here then we may expect to find his matureſt Sentiments, laid down with the utmoſt exactneſs, relating to the *Sacrifice* of the *Euchariſt*. He

He comprizes all the Goſpel Sacrifices under *Two:* one of which is our *Lord*'s own Sacrifice upon the Croſs; and the other is the *Church*'s offering *Herſelf.* The firſt of theſe is *repreſented* and *participated* in the Euchariſt, the latter is *executed:* This is the Sum of his Doctrine. Of the former, he obſerves[e], that it ſucceeded in the room of the *legal* Sacrifices which *prefigured* it: Of the latter He obſerves, that the *legal* Sacrifices were *Signs* or *Symbols* of it[f]. The Legal Sacrifices were, in a *prophetick* and *propitiatory* view, *Figures* of the former, and in a *tropological* view, Figures of the latter. The *Body* of Chriſt He conſiders as twofold, *natural* and *myſtical*; one of which is *repreſented* by us, and *exhibited* by Chriſt in the Euchariſt; the other is *offered* as a proper *Spiritual* Sacrifice[g]: And the Bread and Wine in the Eu-

CHAP. XII.

[e] Id enim Sacrificium ſucceſſit omnibus Sacrificiis Veteris Teſtamenti, quæ immolabantur in *umbra futuri.* Pro illis omnibus Sacrificiis & Oblationibus *corpus* ejus offertur, & participantibus miniſtratur. *Auguſt.* de Civit. Dei, Lib. XVII. cap. 21. p. 484.

[f] Per hoc et Sacerdos eſt, & ipſe Oblatio: Cujus rei Sacramentum quotidianum eſſe voluit *Eccleſiæ Sacrificium*, quæ cum ipſius capitis *Corpus* ſit, *ſeipſam* per Ipſum diſcit offerre. Hujus *veri* Sacrificii multiplicia variaque *ſigna* erant Sacrificia priſca Sanctorum, cum ob hoc unum per multa figuraretur, tanquam verbis multis *res una* diceretur, ut ſine faſtidio multum commendaretur. Huic *ſummo veroque* Sacrificio cuncta Sacrificia *falſa* ceſſerunt. *Ibid.* Lib. X. cap. 20. p 256. Conf. Lib. XIX. cap. 23. p. 227.

[g] Hoc eſt Sacrificium Chriſtianorum, *multi unum Corpus* in Chriſto: Quod etiam *Sacramento Altaris*, Fidelibus noto, frequentat *Eccleſia*, ubi ei demonſtratur, quod in *ea re* quam offert, ipſa offeratur. *Ibid.* Lib. X. cap. 6. p. 243.

Hujus autem præclariſſimum atque optimum *Sacrificium Nos ipſi ſumus*, hoc eſt, Civitas ejus: Cujus rei myſterium celebramus *oblationibus* noſtris, quæ fidelibus notæ ſunt. Lib. XIX. cap. 23. p. 226.

CHAP. XII.

chariſt are conſidered as *Symbols* of *Both*. I ſay, He conſiders the Sacramental Elements not merely as Symbols of the *natural Body*, but of the *myſtical* alſo, *viz.* the *Church*[h], repreſented by the *one Loaf*, and the *one Cup*: So that by the ſame *Symbols* we ſymbolically conſign *ourſelves* over to God, and God conſigns *Chriſt*, with all the Merits of his Death and Paſſion, over to us. At length, his Notion of the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice* reſolves into one compound Idea of a *Spiritual* Sacrifice (wherein the Communicants offer up *Themſelves*) *commemorative* of another Sacrifice, *viz.* the *grand* Sacrifice. The *offering* of the *Body* of Chriſt is a Phraſe capable of two meanings; either to ſignify the *repreſenting* the *natural* Body, or the *devoting* the *myſtical* Body: And *Both* are included in the Euchariſtical Service. Such appears to be St. *Auſtin*'s ſettled Judgment in this Article, grounded, as I ſaid, upon St. *Paul*'s. It is a moſt ridiculous Pretence of Father *Harduin* (which He purſues thro' many tedious Pages[i]) that, according to St. *Auſtin*, Chriſt's *natural* Body is the *Sign*, and his *myſtical* Body the *Thing ſignified* in the Euchariſt: For nothing is plainer from St. *Auſtin*, than that the Bread

[h] *Corpus* ergo Chriſti ſi vis intelligere, Apoſtolum audi dicentem Fidelibus, *vos eſtis corpus Chriſti & membra*. Si ergo vos eſtis *corpus* Chriſti & *membra*, myſterium veſtrum in *menſa* Domini poſitum eſt, myſterium Domini accipitis. —— Nihil hic de noſtro adſeramus; ipſum Apoſtolum item audiamus: Cum ergo de iſto *Sacramento* loqueretur, ait; *unus panis unum Corpus multi ſumus*. —— Recolite enim, quia panis non fit de uno grano, ſed de multis. *Auguſtin*. Serm. 229. p. 976. *Conf.* Serm. 272. p. 1103.

[i] *Harduin*. de Sacramento Altaris, cap. X.

and

and Wine are the only *Signs*, and that the *Things ſignified* by them, are both the *natural*, and the *myſtical* Body of Chriſt, both his *Fleſh* and his *Church*. As the word *offer* is a word of ſome latitude, He ſuppoſes Both to be *offered* in the Euchariſt; one by way of *Memorial* before God, and the other as a real and Spiritual *Sacrifice* unto God. CHAP. XII.

HAVING thus traced this matter down thro' Four Centuries, and part of the Fifth, I cannot think it of moment to deſcend lower, ſince the earlieſt are of principal value, and are alone ſufficient. The Fathers were very wiſe and excellent Men, ſaw very clearly what many learned Moderns have had the misfortune to overlook, and agreed perfectly well in many Points, about which the Moderns have been ſtrangely divided. The Fathers well underſtood, that to make Chriſt's *natural* Body the real Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, would not only be *abſurd* in Reaſon, but highly *preſumptuous*, and *profane*; and that to make the outward *Symbols* a proper Sacrifice, a *material* Sacrifice, would be entirely contrary to Goſpel Principles, degrading the *Chriſtian* Sacrifice into a *Jewiſh* one, yea and making it much lower and meaner than the *Jewiſh*, both in *Value* and *Dignity*[k]. The right way therefore was, to make the Sacrifice *Spiritual:* And it could be no other upon Goſpel Principles. Thus both

[k] How contemptibly the *Romaniſts* ſpeak of a *material* Sacrifice in that view, may be ſeen in Biſhop *Morton* (p. 438.) who has collected their Sentiments upon it.

CHAP. XII.

Extremes were avoided, all Perplexities removed, and Truth and Godlineſs ſecured.

So then here I may take leave of the *Ancients*, as to the preſent Article. The *whole* of the matter is well comprized, and clearly expreſſed in a very few words, by as judicious a Divine as any our Church has had: "We offer "up our *Alms*; we offer up our *Prayers*, our "*Praiſes*, and our *ſelves*: And all theſe we "offer up in the Virtue and Conſideration of "*Chriſt*'s *Sacrifice*, repreſented before us [I "would only add, *and before God*] by way of "*Remembrance*, or *Commemoration*; nor can it "be proved, that the *Ancients* did more than "this: This *whole Service* was their *Chriſtian* "*Sacrifice*, and this is ours[l]." A learned Foreigner has likewiſe very briefly, and juſtly expreſſed the nature of the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*; whoſe words I have thrown to the Bottom of the Page[m], for the learned Reader.

[l] Archbiſhop *Sharpe*, Vol. VII. Serm, XI. pag. 253. If any one is diſpoſed to trace this matter down, even to the *dark* Ages, He will find that moſt of the *Greek* and *Latin* Liturgies contain the ſame Notion with the *Fathers*, of the *Spiritual Sacrifice* in the Euchariſt. See *Covel*. Acc. of Gr. Church, Pr. p. 47. Book p. 36, 41, 46, 53, 67, 68, 175. *Deyling*. Obſervat. Miſcellan. p. 310, &c.

[m] *Oblatio* omnis quæ fit a credentibus ſub *Novo Teſtamento*, eſt *incruenta*, & vero caſtiſſima, & ſimpliciſſima, quia *Spiritualis*. Sive quis *ſe ipſum*, ſive σῶμα ſuum, *Affectum*, omneſque ſuas *Facultates* & *Actiones* Deo offerat ut *Sacrificium*; ſive aliâ χάριτι, *Miniſtri* verbi, qui in nobis convertendis laborarunt, *nos offerant Deo*; ſive *Preces*, εὐχαριστίας, *Supplicationes* noſtras feramus ad Deum, ubique eadem Ratio: Nullus hic funditur *Sanguis*, nihil committitur *violentum*; Actio tota eſt *Spiritualis*, & λογική. *Vitringa* in Iſa. LXVI. 21. pag. 951.

I SHALL

I SHALL now ſhut up this Chapter with two or three ſhort *Corollaries*, which naturally offer, and may be of ſome uſe. CHAP. XII.

1. THE firſt is, that this *Sacrificial* view of the Euchariſt ſquares exactly with the *Federal* view before given. For, if it be really a *Spiritual* Sacrifice, in or by which every faithful Communicant *devotes* Himſelf entirely to God; and if the *Sacerdotal* offering up our Lord's *myſtical* Body be (as St. *Auſtin* explains this matter) a Sacerdotal *devoting* all the faithful joining it, to God's Service, and to God's Glory; then may we again juſtly conclude, that the Sacramental Service is a *federal*, as well as a *Sacrificial* Solemnity: Becauſe, in this Caſe, the Adminiſtrator's *devoting* the Communicants, and their *devoting* themſelves to God, is tantamount to a ſolemn *renewing* former Engagements, or *Covenants* made with Him, under ſuch *Symbols*, as God has appointed, and promiſed to ratify on His Part.

2. FROM hence may be underſtood, how *Chriſtians*, at large, are *Prieſts* unto God[n]: For, every one that *ſacrificeth*, is ſo far a *Prieſt*. Therefore *Juſtin Martyr* repreſents *Chriſtians* in common, as ſo many *Prieſts*, offering their *Sacrifices* in the Euchariſt[o]. And *Iſidorus*, ſo late as the Fifth Century, does the like[p], reckoning every Man a *Prieſt*, when He offers up

[n] 1 *Pet.* II. 5. 9. *Rev.* I 6. V. 10. XX 6.

[o] *Juſtin Mart.* Dial. p. 386. Conf. *Origen.* in Levit. Hom. IX. pag. 236.

[p] *Iſidorus Peluſiot.* Lib. III. Ep. 75. pag. 284.

CHAP. XII.

his *own Body*, or Himſelf, a *Sacrifice* unto God, by Sacrificing his Luſts and Paſſions. Nevertheleſs the proper Officers, who miniſter in Holy Things, and who offer up to God both the *Sacrifices* and *Sacrificers*, are *Prieſts* in a more eminent and emphatical Senſe; as *Iſidorus* obſerves in the ſame Place, and as the Reaſon of the Thing itſelf ſufficiently evidences[q]. I may farther note, that as Chriſtians at large were conſidered as *Prieſts* on account of their offering *Spiritual Sacrifices*, ſo their *Conſecration* to ſuch their Prieſthood was ſuppoſed to be performed in or by *Baptiſm:* or, in other words, their Baptiſm was their Conſecration[r].

3. A THIRD *Corollary* is, that the *Socinians*, or others, who reject both the *Sacrificial* and *Federal* view, do not only cauſeleſsly *depreciate* a venerable *Sacrament* and *Sacrifice*, but at the ſame time do the greateſt diſſervice imaginable to *practical* Religion. For, as the *Sacrificial* Notion of the Euchariſt, here explained, carries in it the moſt inſtructive and compendious Leſſon of *Chriſtian Practice*, ſo does the *Federal*

[q] Cum omnes credentes N. T. ſint *Sacerdotes* reſpectu ſtatus *ſpiritualis*, & juris *appropinquandi* Deo in ſummo *Pontifice* Jeſu; *Miniſtri* verbi, diſpenſatores myſteriorum Dei, quatenus a Deo *electi* ſunt, ut circa ſacra publica verſentur, reſpectu quodam *œconomico* & *externo*, in externa Eccleſiæ πολιτείᾳ fundato, Hunc Titulum ſibi *peculiari modo* vendicant. *Vitringa* in Iſa. LXVI. 21. p. 951. Conf. *Vitring.* in Apocalypſ. p 335.

N. B. This Argument is diſcuſſed at large by Mr. *Dodwell*, *De Jure Laico Sacerdotali*, and by other Tracts going along with him.

[r] *Tertullian* de Monogam. cap. VII. p. 529. *Origen* in Levit. Hom. IX. 238. *Cyrill.* Hieroſol. Catech. XVIII. cap. 33. p. 301. *Ambroſiaſter.* de Sacram. Lib. IV. cap. 1. p. 365. Ed. Bened.

Notion

Notion of the ſame carry in it the ſtrongeſt engagements to bind us for ever to it. The removing theſe awakening Hints, and the diſſolving theſe ſacred Ties, under fair and ſmooth Pretences of ſupporting *Practical Chriſtianity*, is betraying great want of Judgment, or want of Sincerity; becauſe there cannot be a more dangerous, or more fatal way of ſubverting, by little and little, all true *Chriſtian Morality*. CHAP. XII.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Preparation proper for the HOLY COMMUNION.

IF we have hitherto gone upon ſure grounds, with reſpect to the *Nature*, *Ends*, and *Uſes* of the *Holy Communion*, there can be no doubt made, but that ſo *ſacred*, and ſo *ſalutary* an Inſtitution ought to be held in great *Reverence*, and to be obſerved with all *Joy* and *Thankfulneſs*, tempered with *Godly Fear*. If we conſider it either as a *Divine* Ordinance coeval with Chriſtianity, and perfective of it, or as a ſolemn *Memorial* of *God* made *Man*, or as an Inſtrument, whereby *God* vouchſafes to receive us, *Chriſt* to dwell in us, and the *Holy Ghoſt* to ſhed his bleſſed Influences upon us; or if we conſider it as the nobleſt Part of *Chriſtian Worſhip*, the *renewing* of our *Covenant* with God, the *ſacrificing* of the *Heart*, and the *devoting* of the *Affections*, and all that we have, to his *Service*, and to his *Glory*; or if we farther con-

CHAP. XIII.

ſider it as a *Badge* of our moſt holy *Profeſſion*, and as a Band or Cement of *Union*, whereby we abide in Chriſt, and have Fellowſhip with all the Family of Heaven[r]; in which ſoever of theſe Views we contemplate this Holy Ceremony, it muſt appear to be a matter of infinite concern to us, and highly deſerving our moſt affectionate and devout Regards. How we ought to expreſs our eſteem of it, is the next Thing to be enquired into: And the general Rule here is, that we take care to do it in ſuch a way, as may beſt anſwer thoſe Heavenly and ſalutary Purpoſes, for which this Holy Sacrament was ordained. Our eſteem, or diſeſteem of it will be ſeen by our Conduct; by our frequenting or not frequenting it, by our preparing or not preparing for it, as alſo by our manner of Behaviour at the Time of receiving, or after. My preſent concern is with the *Preparatory* Part. There is ſomething of a *Preparation* of Heart, Mind, and Ways, required for all Religious Offices[t]; much more for This, which is the Flower and Perfection of all: And now the only remaining Queſtion is, *what* Preparation is here requiſite, or whereof it conſiſts. The *Nature* and *Ends* of the Inſtitution, laid down above, will be our ſure Marks of Direction, and cannot miſlead us, if carefully attended to. Let us come to Particulars.

1. *Baptiſm*, it is well known, muſt go before

[r] *Hebr.* XII. 22, 23, 24.
[t] *Eccleſ.* V. 1, 2. 1 *Sam.* VII. 3. 2 *Chron.* XXXV. 6.

the

the Euchariſt, like as Circumciſion was *previous* to the Paſſover. A Perſon muſt be *admitted* into Covenant firſt, in order to *renew*; muſt be *initiated*, in order to be *perfected*; muſt be *born* into the Chriſtian Life, before He takes in the additional *Food* proper to ſupport and increaſe it. Of this there can be no diſpute, and ſo I need not ſay much of it. There is an Inſtance in Antiquity, as high as the Third Century, of a Perſon who had long been a *Communicant*, and who afterwards found reaſon to doubt whether He had been *validly* baptized, and thereupon ſcrupled the coming again to the *Lord's Table*. His Biſhop adviſed Him, in that Caſe (conſidering how long He had been a *Communicant*, and *honeſtly* all the time) to go on without ſcruple; not preſuming to give Him *Baptiſm*, which now ſeemed to be *ſuperceded* by the long and frequent uſe of this other Sacrament[u]. The Caſe was very particular, and the Reſolution, probably, wiſe and juſt: Both the Scruple on one hand, and the Determination on the other (made with ſome *heſitancy*, and ſcarce *ſatisfactory* to the Party) ſhew, how acknowledged a Principle of the Church it then was, that *Baptiſm* is ordinarily a moſt eſſential Part of the Qualification required for receiving the Holy Communion.

CHAP. XIII.

[u] *Euſeb.* Eccl. Hiſt. Lib. VII. cap. 9. But *Timothy*, afterwards Biſhop of the ſame See (about *A. D.* 380.) determined, that if a *Catechumen* ignorantly ſhould happen to receive the Communion, He ſhould forthwith be *baptized*, purſuant to ſuch call of God. *Timoth. Alexandr.* Can. I. Hard. p. 1192. Tom. I.

Confir-

CHAP. XIII.

Confirmation beſides, is highly *expedient*[w], but Baptiſm is ſtrictly *neceſſary*.

2. A *competent knowledge* of what the Communion means, is another *previous* Qualification. St. *Paul* teaches, that a Perſon, coming to the Lord's Table, ſhould *examine* or approve *Himſelf*, and that He ſhould *diſcern* the *Lord's Body*[x]: Both which do ſuppoſe a *competent* knowledge of what the Sacrament *means*, and of what it *requires*[y]. And from thence may be drawn a very juſt and weighty Argument againſt *Infant Communion*. But I return to the Point in hand. As to the *meaſure* of the competent knowledge required for receiving the Communion, it muſt of courſe vary, according to the various Opportunities, Abilities, Circumſtances of the Parties concerned; to be judged of by themſelves, with the Aſſiſtance of their proper Guides. Great Care was anciently taken in inſtructing the *Adults*, called *Catechumens*, in order to *Baptiſm*: Something of like kind will be always proper, in ſuch Circumſtances as ours, for the preparing Perſons for the *firſt* Time of receiving the Holy Communion.

3. A *ſound* and *right Faith*, as to the main Subſtance of the Chriſtian Religion, is another *previous* Qualification for this Sacrament. For whether we conſider it as a *Renewal* of our

[w] See the *Rubrick* at the end of our *Order* of *Confirmation*: And the Conſtitutions of Archbiſhop *Peckham*, *A. D.* 1281. Spelm. Concil. Tom. II. p. 331.

[x] 1 *Cor.* XI. 28, 29.

[y] Ὀρθὸς Βίος, ἅμα μαθόντι τὴν κυριακήν. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. I. pag. 318.

Baptiſmal

Baptiſmal *Profeſſion* and *Covenant*, which is engaging to obſerve the *Goſpel Terms*; or whether we conſider it as an *Inſtrument* of *Pardon* and *Grace*, and a *Pledge* of the Inheritance among the Saints in Light; *ſound Faith* muſt undoubtedly be required, to anſwer ſuch Ends and Uſes of it. Scripture has not directly ſaid ſo, as there was no occaſion for it; ſince the very nature of the Thing, taking in Scripture Principles, very fully and plainly declares it. Accordingly, we find, as early almoſt as we have any Records left, that *true* and *ſound* Faith was very particularly required in thoſe that came to the Lord's Table[z]. Beſides a *right Faith* in the general, a *particular* Belief with reſpect to the *Graces* and *Benefits* of a worthy Reception of this Sacrament, was anciently, as well as reaſonably judged to be a *previous* Qualification for it, requiſite to render it ſalutary to the Recipient. It would be tedious to produce Authorities for it, and therefore I chooſe to refer the Reader to the Collections of that kind already made to our Hands[a].

CHAP. XIII.

4. ABOVE all Things, *Repentance* ought to be looked upon as a moſt eſſential Qualification for a due reception of the Holy Communion. All the *Ends* and *Uſes* of the Sacrament declare

[z] Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, ἧς ἐξεστι μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ μεταλαμβάνειν ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ διδασκόμενα ὑπ' ἡμῶν. *Juſt. Mart.* p. 96. Hitherto belongs the noted Proclamation antiently made by the *Deacons*, before the Communion began: Μή τις τῶν ἐπαγγέλλων: *Let no Miſbeliever come to the Lord's Table.* Vid. *Apoſtol. Conſtitut.* Lib. VIII. cap. 12. p. 403.

[a] *Bingham*, Book XV. cap. 8. § 8.

CHAP. XIII.

it: The Reaſon of the Thing itſelf loudly proclames it. For, without That, what is *covenanting*, but playing the *Hypocrite?* What is *devoting* ourſelves to God at his Table, but *Lying* and *Diſſembling?* How is it poſſible to hold *Communion* at once with *God* and *Baal*, with *Chriſt* and *Belial?* Or how can the *Spirit* of *God*, and the Spirit that *worketh* in the *Children* of *Diſobedience*, dwell together? It is plain therefore, that *Repentance*, in ſome degree or other, and a Heart turned to God, is eſſentially neceſſary to make the Sacrament *ſalutary*, yea and to prevent its proving *hurtful* to the Receiver.

IF we look into the *Ancients*, upon this Head, we ſhall find them with united Voice declaring, that *Repentance* is abſolutely neceſſary to make a *worthy* Receiver. *Juſtin Martyr* ſpecifies it among the previous Qualifications, that the Communicant ſhall be one who *lives according as Chriſt has commanded*[b]. *Clemens*, of the ſame Century, intimates, that a *good Life*[c] is requiſite to a due receiving, and to prevent the receiving *unworthily* in St. *Paul*'s Senſe; quoting 1 *Cor.* XI. 27, 28. *Origen* interprets the ſame Words to mean, that the Sacrament muſt not be taken with a *Soul defiled and polluted with Sin*[d]. St. *Cyprian* alſo more than once

[b] Οὕτως βιῶνλι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. *Juſtin.* Apol. 1. p. 96.

[c] *Clemens Alex.* ὀρθὸς βίος, ἄρα μαθήσεως ἢ καθηκούσης. Strom. I. pag. 318.

[d] Ne in anima contaminata & peccatis polluta, Dominici corporis Sacramenta percipias. *Quicunque enim manducaverit*, inquit, *panem*,

once repreſents it as receiving *unworthily*, when a Man comes to the Lord's Table, before He has *expiated* his *Offences*, *confeſſed* his *Crimes*, *purged* his *Conſcience*, and *appeaſed* the Anger of God[e]. All which ſhews, that He underſtood the Text of St. *Paul*, not merely of the *manner* of Behaviour at receiving, but of the previous *Qualifications* of the Receiver. In the ſame *general* way is the Apoſtle interpreted by the *ancient* Commentators on that Chapter[f]. But becauſe ſome Perſons had made a diſtinction between being *unworthy* to receive, and receiving *unworthily*; to cut off all evaſion ſought for in that nicety, it was replied; that if the Apoſtle had reſtrained even the *worthy* from receiving *unworthily*, He had much more reſtrained every *unworthy* Perſon from receiving at all; being that ſuch a one is not capable of receiving *worthily*, while He continues ſuch, that is, while He goes on in his *Vices*[g]. There is ſcarce

CHAP. XIII.

panem, & biberit calicem Domini indignè, reus erit, &c. —— Cibus iſte ſanctus non eſt communis omnium, nec cujuſcunque *indigni*, ſed *Sanctorum* eſt. *Origen* in *Lev.* Hom. XIII. p. 257. *Conf.* in *Matt.* p. 254. Ed. Huet.

[e] Contumacibus & pervicacibus comminatur & denuntiat, dicens: *Quicunque ederit Panem, aut biberit Calicem Domini indignè, reus erit Corporis & Sanguinis Domini.* Spretis his omnibus atque contemptis, ante *expiata* delicta, ante *exomologeſim* factam criminis, ante *purgatam conſcientiam* Sacrificio & manu Sacerdotis, ante *offenſam placatam* indignantis Domini & minantis, vis infertur Corpori ejus & Sanguini, *&c.* *Cypr.* de Lapſ. p. 186. *Conf.* p. 19, 20, 141. Edit. Bened.

[f] *Chryſoſtom.* in loc. p. 301. & de Pœnit. Hom. VII. p. 326. Tom. II. Bened. *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Damaſcene*, *Theophylact*, *Pelagius* inter opp. Hieronym. *Ambroſiaſter*, *Caſſiodorus* complex, p. 37. Conf. *Gregor. Nyſſen.* de Perfect. Chriſtian. p. 718.

[g] Quidam ſane dicunt, quia non *indignum*, ſed *indignè* accipientem

CHAP. XIII.

ſcarce any one Principle more *univerſally* agreed upon among the *Ancients*, than this, that *Repentance* and newneſs of Life is a *neceſſary* Preparation, or Qualification for the Holy Communion, and is implied in *worthy* receiving.

IT has been pleaded, in abatement, that the Apoſtle, by his caution againſt receiving *unworthily*, intended only to cenſure all *irreverent* Behaviour at the Table, and that the Cenſure or Admonition there given, concerns rather the *manner* of receiving, than the *previous* Qualifications of the Receiver[h]. But to this Pretext ſufficient Replies have been made by the more judicious[i]. I may briefly obſerve, 1. That, if the Apoſtle had ſaid nothing at all of *unworthy* receiving, yet the *Reaſon of the Thing* would ſhew, that the receiving of the Communion with diſpoſitions *repugnant* to the end and uſe of it, is receiving *unworthily*, and offering an Affront to its Author. 2. That the Apoſtle's Reproof to the *Corinthians*, in that Chapter, was not leveled barely againſt an *irreverent manner* of receiving, but againſt the *ill Spirit*, and the *unchriſtian Temper*, with which They came to the Lord's Table: They were *contentious*, and full

tem revocat a *Sancto*. Si ergo etiam dignus *indignè* accedens retrahitur, quanto magis *indignus*, qui non poteſt accipere *dignè*? Unde oportet otioſum ceſſare *a vitiis*, ut ſanctum Domini Corpus *ſanctè* percipiat. *Pelagius* in loc.

[h] See Mr. *Lock* on 1 *Cor.* XI. 28. *Arth. Bury*'s Conſtant Communicant, p. 250, &c.

[i] *Jenkins*, Remarks on ſome Books, p. 140 —— 145.
Le Clerc, Biblioth. Choiſ. Tom. XIII. p. 96.
Wolfius, Cur. Crit. in 1 *Cor.* XI. 28.

of

of *Animoſities*, ſplit into *Factions* and *Parties*[k]; and from thence aroſe all their other diſorders. Therefore the Apoſtle both began and concluded his Admonition[l] with particular Cautions againſt the Spirit of *diviſion* then reigning amongſt them; a Temper very improper for a Feaſt of Love and Amity. 3. There is no Reaſon for reſtraining the Apoſtle's *general* Rules, laid down upon a *ſpecial* occaſion, to that *particular* Caſe only, eſpecially when the *Reaſon* of them extends equally to more. The Apoſtle ſays, *whoſoever* ſhall receive *unworthily*, &c. not confining what He ſays of it, to *This* way, or *That*. If it be receiving *unworthily*, in *any ways whatever*, his words are *general* enough to comprehend them all: And ſo are his other words; *Let* every one *examine Himſelf*, and then *eat*, &c. and let Him *diſcern*, diſcriminate, eſteem, reverence *the Lord's Body*. Therefore *Chryſoſtom*, upon the Place[m], highly extols the wiſdom of the Apoſtle, in making ſuch excellent uſe of a *particular* Caſe, as thereupon to lay down *general* Rules for all Caſes of like nature, for the ſtanding uſe of the Church in all Times to come. Accordingly the judicious *Theodoret* takes notice, that the Apoſtle in verſe the *27th*, where He ſpeaks of receiving *unworthily*, obliquely rebuked the *Ambitious*, and the *Fornicators*, and Thoſe alſo who CHAP. XIII.

[k] 1 *Cor.* XI. 18, 19. Compare 1 *Cor.* I. 11, 12.

[l] 1 *Cor.* XI. 33, 34.

[m] *Chryſoſtom* in 1 *Cor.* XI. Hom. XXVIII. p. 300, &c. Conf. *Damaſcen.* in loc. p. 102. *Oecumenius*, p. 532. *Theophylact*, p. 260. Compare *Jenkins*, p 142, 143.

had

CHAP. XIII.

had eaten of Things *offered* unto *Idols*; and, in ſhort, all that come to the Communion with a *guilty Conſcience*[n]. 4. Let it be conſidered, whether ſuch as the Apoſtle forbids us to *eat with*[o], and whether Thoſe whom the Apoſtle cenſures as *Partakers of the Table of Devils*[p], and Thoſe whom He elſewhere deſcribes as making *one Body* with *Harlots*[q], could be capable, while ſo abiding, of receiving *worthily*? If they could not, then the general Rule of the Apoſtle, laid down in 1 *Cor.* XI. about receiving *unworthily*, muſt be underſtood to extend farther than to the *particular* diſorders, which occaſioned it. But if it be ſaid, that ſuch, ſo abiding, might notwithſtanding receive *worthily*, then theſe Abſurdities will follow; that Perſons who are not fit for Chriſtians to *eat with*, or who are Communicants of *Devils*; or who are incapable of being *living* Members of Chriſt, or *Temples* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, are yet capable of *worthily* receiving that *Symbolical* Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are appointed to ſtrengthen our *Union* with Him, and which ſuppoſe Men to be *living Members* of Him, at their coming to receive.

Add to this, that St. *Paul* Himſelf has elſewhere laid down a general Rule, obliging all Chriſtians to come *clean* to the *Chriſtian Paſſover*, drawn from the conſideration of what was preſcribed with reſpect to the *Jewiſh* one[r].

[n] *Theodoret* in 1 *Cor.* XI. 27.
[o] 1 *Cor.* V. 11.
[p] 1 *Cor.* X. 20, 21.
[q] 1 *Cor.* VI. 15, 16.
[r] 1 *Cor.* V. 7, 8.

For

For if the Feaſt there mentioned, does not directly mean the *Euchariſtical Feaſt*, but the *whole Chriſtian Life* conſidered as a *Feaſt of Holineſs*; yet the *Reaſon* there given, will hold more ſtrongly for thoſe *particular Seaſons*, when we are actually celebrating the Memorial of *Chriſt our Paſſover Lamb*, as *ſacrificed for us*. For, as at all Times, ſo *then* more *eſpecially*, ought we to *purge out the old Leaven*, and to keep the ſacred Feaſt with the *unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth*. CHAP. XIII.

UPON the whole, it muſt be allowed, that St. *Paul*'s general Rule will by Parity of Reaſon reach farther than the particular Caſes there mentioned, and muſt be underſtood to exclude all *impenitent* Offenders. This the *Socinians* themſelves make no Scruple to allow [f]; as indeed it is ſo clear a Caſe, that there can be but very little room left for any reaſonable Diſpute.

IT remains ſtill to be conſidered, what *Repentance* really means, or wherein it conſiſts. In the general, it means a new Heart, or a ſerious Reſolution to amend what we find amiſs, to the utmoſt of our Power, and a deliberate Intention to live a Life of *Holineſs* [t] for the future; ſquaring our Conduct, as near as Human

[f] *Crellius*, Ethic. Chriſtian. L. III. c. 10. p. 354.
Slichting in 1 Cor. XI. 28. p. 58.
Przipcovius in loc.

[t] The ancient way was to proclaim before the Service began, ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. *Cyrill. Hieroſol.* Myſtag. V. p. 331. A *Form* occurring in all the old Liturgies, and which *Chryſoſtom* interprets to mean, εἴ τις ϛὸκ ἐϛὶν ἅγιος, μὴ προϛίτω, *If a Man is not Holy, let him not come near.* In *Hebr.* Hom. XVII. p. 585. See alſo above, p. 402.

CHAP. XIII.

Infirmities will permit, by the unerring Rule of God's Commandments. To be more particular, there are *Four* principal Articles, which the *Ancients*, in this Caſe, moſt inſiſted upon, as previous Qualifications for receiving the Holy Communion: I ſhall conſider them one by one, but as briefly as may be.

1. ONE was, *Reſtitution* or *Reparation*, for any *Wrongs* done to others in their Perſons, Eſtate, or good Name, to the utmoſt of our Ability [v]. This is but *common* Juſtice, or *moral* Honeſty, and therefore muſt be looked upon as an *eſſential* Article of Amendment. It would lead me too far, to undertake here to ſtate the exact Rules or Meaſures of it: Thoſe may be learned from ſound *Caſuiſts*, who have profeſſedly weighed and conſidered the Subject [w]. In ordinary Caſes, an honeſt Mind will not much need an Inſtructor, but every well diſpoſed Perſon may be his own beſt Caſuiſt. All I ſhall hint, is, that for *publick* Wrongs, *publick* Satisfaction is moſt proper, as being perhaps the only one that can ſufficiently repair the publick Injury: But for *ſecret* Wrongs, the more *ſecret* the Reparation is, ſo much the better, other Circumſtances being equal; becauſe ſo the Wrong is repaired, and at the ſame Time ill Blood prevented, future Suſpicions obviated, Peace and Amity ſecured.

[v] See *Bingham*, B. XV. c. 8. § 10.

[w] Bp. *Tillotſon*'s Poſth. Serm. 116, 117. p. 82, &c. fol. Edit. *Placette*, Chriſtian Caſuiſt, or Treatiſe on Conſcience, B. I. c. 20, 21, 22. Abridgment of Morality.

To

To this Head belongs, what our Lord ſays: CHAP. XIII.
If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there remembereſt that thy Brother hath ought againſt thee; leave there thy Gift before the Altar, and go thy way, firſt be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift [x]. The Lord's Supper was not inſtituted, when theſe Words were ſpoken: Nevertheleſs, they are applicable to it, in a View to the *general* Reaſon, on which the Rule ſtands; and they have been often ſo applied both by Ancients and Moderns. Mr. *Mede* has well proved, that the Precept is *Evangelical* [y], tho' worded in *Jewiſh* Terms, ſuited to the Time wherein it was given. The Diſciples of our Lord (that is *Believers* at large, to whom that divine *Sermon* was directed [z]) were *Jews* and *Chriſtians* both in one, and therefore could not be properly addreſſed in any Language, but what might competently ſuit them in ſuch their double Capacity. The like was the Caſe with reſpect to the *Lord's Prayer*, which tho' a *Chriſtian* Prayer, was yet formed in ſuch general Terms, as might indifferently ſerve a Religious *Jew*, at the Time when it was given. I ſay then, that the Precept delivered by our Lord, about the great Duty of *Reparation* to be made to every *injured* Brother, before we *offer* to God, tho' an *Evangelical* Precept, was yet ſo worded as to comport with the then

[x] *Matth.* V. 23, 24.

[y] *Mede* Diſc. XLVI. p. 357, &c. Edit. 1664. Compare *Johnſon's* Propit. Oblat. p. 19, &c. And *Lewis's* Anſwer to Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 32.

[z] See *Blair* on the Sermon in the Mount, Vol. I. Serm. II, III. p. 27, &c.

CHAP. XIII.

preſent Circumſtances of the Perſons, to whom it was directed. When Circumſtances came to be altered, the *general* Reaſon ſtill continued the ſame, and the Application of it was eaſy and obvious to every Capacity.

Irenæus quotes the Text, and adapts it to *Chriſtian* Circumſtances in a very juſt and natural Way. *Gifts* He interprets to mean Chriſtian Worſhip, Alms, and Oblations: And by *Altar*, He underſtands the high Altar in Heaven [a]. *Tertullian*, in like manner, accommodates it to the Caſe of Chriſtians coming to offer up their *Prayers* to God; intimating, that They ought firſt to be *at peace* with their offended Brethren, and to bring with them a *forgiving* Temper, as they hoped to be forgiven [b]. Both Parts are true: But the latter appears *foreign* with reſpect to this Text, which relates not to *pardoning* others who have injured us, but rather to the *ſeeking Pardon* where we have injured. However, as the two Parts are near allied, it was eaſy to blend Ideas, and to run both into one; as ſeveral other Fathers did. *Cyprian* alſo accommodates the Precept to *Chriſtian* Circumſtances, interpreting the *Gift* of *Prayers*, which ought to be offered with a *pacifick* Temper of Mind [c]. Elſewhere He applies it to the *Euchariſtical* Prayers and Services [d]. *Euſebius* and *Cyril* apply the Text much in the

[a] *Iren* Lib. IV. c. 18. p. 250, 252. Conf. *Pfaffius*, p. 57, 58.
[b] *Tertullian*. de Pœnitent. c. XII. p. 147. de Orat. c. X. p. 133. & contr. Marc. Lib. IV. c. 9. p. 420.
[c] *Cyprian*. de Oratione, p. 211.
[d] *Cyprian*. de Unit. Eccl. p. 198.

ſame way [e]. And *Origen* interprets the *Gift* to mean *Prayer* [f]. The *Conſtitutions* called *Apoſtolical* interpret *Gift* of Prayer, Praiſe, and Thankſgiving, and the *Precept* of entertaining no *Enmity* againſt others, and taking what care we can, that They may have no *juſt ground* of complaint againſt us [g]. *Chryſoſtom* accommodates the Precept to the *Prayers* and *Alms* offered at the Holy Communion, which would not be accepted, if not brought *in Charity*, and with a *peaceful* Mind [h]. In another Homily [i], He preſſes the Point ſomewhat farther, and ſays many good Things of the care we ought to take to make up Differences, if poſſible, even with thoſe, who without any juſt Cauſe are our *Enemies*; that ſo we may reſtore them, and heal their Sores, and gain them over to good will. All which is right, if tempered with the Rules of Chriſtian *Prudence*, and not ſtrained ſo far, as to make well diſpoſed and truly peaceable Perſons ſtay away from the Lord's Table upon *needleſs* Scruples; ariſing either from the *irreconcilable* Temper of others, or from a want of due Diſcernment of what is *ſafe*, *prudent*, or *proper* under ſuch or ſuch Circumſtances. Improper, or indiſcreet Overtures made by the offended Party towards an Offender, may often widen the

CHAP. XIII.

[e] *Euſebius* de Vit Conſtant. Lib. IV. c. 41.
Cyrill. Hieroſol. Myſtag. V. p. 326.
[f] *Origen.* de Orat. p. 198.
[g] *Conſtitut. Apoſtol.* Lib. II. c. 53. p. 260.
[h] *Chryſoſtom.* in Matt. Hom. XVI. p. 217. Edit. Bened. Tom. VII.
[i] *Chryſoſtom.* de Simult. Hom. XX. p. 206, &c. Tom. II.

CHAP. XIII.

Breach which they mean to heal, and may increaſe the Miſchief, inſtead of curing it.

Jerome, upon the Text, appears rather *argute* than *ſolid*; where He comments to this effect, if I underſtand Him: "It is not ſaid, "*if you take any Thing amiſs of your Brother*, "but *if your Brother takes any Thing amiſs of* "*you*; to make the Terms of Reconciliation ſo "much the harder. So long as we are not able "to *pacify* the Party, I know not whether we "ought to offer our Gifts unto God [k]." This is ſtraining the Point too far, if it means any thing more than the uſing all *ſafe*, *prudent*, and *reaſonable* endeavours to remove cauſeleſs Offences, where a Perſon is ignorant, or froward.

St. *Auſtin*, who had a cooler Head than *Jerome*, and was a more exact Caſuiſt, has given the juſteſt and cleareſt Account of this Text, that I have met with; perhaps with a Deſign to take off ſuch Scruples as *Jerome*'s Account might have raiſed. As to the *Gift* mentioned, He interprets it of *Propheſy*, that is *Doctrine*, and *Prayers*, and *Hymns*, and the like *Spiritual* Services [l]. And as to the *Precept*, He explains it thus: "If we call to mind that *our Brother has* "*ought againſt us*; that is, *if we have any way*

[k] Non dixit, *Si Tu habes aliquid adverſus Fratrem tuum*, ſed *ſi Frater tuus habet aliquid adverſum Te*; ut durior Reconciliationis Tibi imponatur neceſſitas. Quamdiu illum placare non poſſumus, neſcio an conſequenter munera noſtra offeramus Deo. *Hieron.* in loc Tom. IV. p. 16. Edit. Bened.

[l] Quodlibet enim *munus* offerimus Deo, ſive *prophetiam*, ſive *Doctrinam*, ſive *Orationem*, ſive *Hymnum*, ſive *Pſalmum*, & ſi quid tale aliud *Spiritualium* donorum animo occurrit, &c. *Auguſtin.* de Serm. Domini in Mont. p. 176. Edit. Bened. Tom. III.

"*injured*

" *injured Him*; for then it is that *He has ſome-* CHAP.
" *thing againſt us.* But, if He has injured us, XII.
" then *we have ſomething againſt Him:* In which
" Caſe, there is no occaſion to go to Him for
" Reconcilement. You would not *aſk Pardon*
" of the Man that has done you an Injury; it
" is ſufficient that you *forgive* Him, as you de-
" ſire Forgiveneſs at God's Hands for what you
" have offended in. We are to go therefore to
" be *reconciled*, when it comes into our Mind,
" that haply we may have ſome way in-
" jured our Brother [m]." The Sum then of all is, that if we are *certain* that we have done any Man an *Injury* in his Perſon, Eſtate, or good Name, or that we have given *juſt* Cauſe of Offence, it is our Duty and Buſineſs to make *Reparation*, and to ſue firſt for Reconcilement: Or if we are not certain, but *probably ſuſpect* that we have been guilty that way, the ſame Rule will ſtill hold in Proportion. But if we have good Reaſon to judge that the Perſon has really *injured us*, or has cauſeleſsly and capticuſly *taken* Offence where none was *given*, then be it to Himſelf: There is nothing in this Text obliging an innocent Perſon, in ſuch a Caſe, to make the firſt Step towards Reconcile-

[m] Si in mentem venerit, quod *aliquid habeat adverſum nos Frater*; id eſt, *ſi nos eum in aliquo læſimus:* Tunc enim ipſe *habet adverſum nos.* Nam nos *adverſus illum* habemus, ſi ille *nos læſit:* Ubi non opus eſt pergere ad Reconciliationem; non enim veniam poſtulabis ab eo qui Tibi fecit injuriam, ſed tantum dimittes, ſicut Tibi dimitti a Domino cupis, quod ipſe commiſeris. Pergendum eſt ergo ad Reconciliationem, cum in mentem venerit, quod nos fortè Fratrem in aliquo læſimus. *Auguſtin.* ibid.

CHAP. XIII.

ment, or to ſuſpend his Offerings on any ſuch Scruple. There may, in ſome particular Circumſtances, be a kind of Debt of *Charity*, and Chriſtian *Condeſcenſion*, lying upon the *injured* Party, to endeavour to reclaim and pacify the *Offender* by ſoft and healing ways: But as that is a very nice Affair, and the Office ſuch as many are not fit for, there lies no *ſtrict* Obligation in ſuch a Caſe, or at leaſt not upon Chriſtians at large, but upon Thoſe only who are peculiarly fitted for it. Therefore it falls not properly under the Queſtion now in hand, nor within the Precept of the Text, which is *general*, extending equally to all Chriſtians. From the ſummary View here given of what the *Ancients* thought of thoſe Words of our Lord (beſides the clearing an important Caſe of Conſcience, which I chiefly aimed at) it may be noted by the way, that the *Gift* there mentioned, was underſtood of *Spiritual* Sacrifice only, and the *Altar* alſo of courſe muſt have been *Spiritual*, while conſidered as an Altar: Which I take notice of as a Confirmation of what hath been advanced in a preceding Chapter. But I proceed.

2. As making *Reſtitution* for any Offences we have committed, is one neceſſary Article of Sacramental Preparation, ſo is a Readineſs to *forgive* any Offences committed againſt us, another as neceſſary an Article, and much inſiſted upon by the *antient* Churches[n]. This is a Rule laid down by our bleſſed Lord in his Goſpel,

[n] See *Bingham*, XV. 8. 13.

and

and made an *expreſs* Condition of our own *Forgiveneſs*, and left us, for the greater Caution, as an Article of the *Lord's Prayer* to be daily repeated. All the Difficulty lies in clearing and aſcertaining the true and full Meaning of the *Forgiveneſs* required. Our Lord in one Place ſays, *if thy Brother treſpaſs againſt Thee, rebuke Him, and* IF HE REPENT, *forgive Him*; and ſo again and again, as often as *He repents*, forgive[o]. May we then *revenge* ourſelves upon an Enemy, if He does not *repent?* No, by no means: *Vengeance* is God's ſole Right[p]: Man has nothing to do with it. Even *Magiſtrates*, who, in ſome Senſe, are *Revengers*, or Avengers, *to execute Wrath*[q], yet, ſtrictly ſpeaking, are not appointed to diſpenſe *Vengeance*. They do not, They cannot award *Puniſhments* in juſt proportion to *demerits*, as God can do: But They are appointed to act for the *Safety* of the State; and what they do, is a kind of *Self-defence*, in a publick Capacity, rather than a diſpenſing of *Vengeance*. So that even They, properly ſpeaking, are not commiſſioned to *revenge:* Much leſs can any private Perſons juſtly claim any Right to it. *Forgiveneſs*, if underſtood in oppoſition to *Revenge*, is an unlimited Duty, knows no Bounds or Meaſures, is not reſtrained to any *Kind*, or *Number* of Offences, nor to any *Condition* of *repenting:* But all Offences muſt be *forgiven*, in that Senſe, tho' *not repent-*

CHAP. XIII.

[o] *Luke* XVII. 3. 4. *Matth.* XVIII. 21, 22.
[p] *Deut.* XXXII. 35. *Rom.* XII. 19. *Hebr.* X. 30.
[q] *Rom.* XIII. 4.

ed

CHAP. XIII.

ed of, tho' ever ſo cruelly, or ſo maliciouſly carried on, and perſiſted in. Therefore the *Forgiveneſs* which our Lord ſpeaks of, as limited to the *Repentance* of the Party offending, can mean only the receiving a Perſon into ſuch a Degree of Friendſhip, or Intimacy, as He before had: A Thing not *ſafe*, nor *reaſonable*, unleſs He ſhews ſome Tokens of Sorrow for his Fault, and ſome Signs of a ſincere Intention to do ſo no more. *Forgive* Him in ſuch a Senſe, as to meditate no *Revenge*, to *wiſh* Him *well*, and to *pray* for Him, and even to do Him good in a way prudent, and proper: But admit Him not into *Confidence*, nor *truſt* yourſelf with Him, till He repents: For That would be acting too far againſt the great Law of *Self-preſervation*. Only, take care on the other hand, not to be over *diſtruſtful*, nor to ſtand upon the *utmoſt Proofs* of his relenting Sincerity, but rather riſque ſome Relapſes. This, I think, in the general, is a juſt Account of *Goſpel-forgiveneſs* [r].

BUT to prevent all needleſs Scruples, I may explain it a little further, in ſome diſtinct Articles. 1. *Goſpel-forgiveneſs* interferes not with proper *Diſcipline*, nor the bringing *Offenders* in a *legal* way, to *publick* Juſtice. An *Informer* may proſecute, a *Witneſs* accuſe, a *Jury* bring in guilty, a *Judge* condemn, and an *Executioner* diſpatch a Criminal, without any proper *Malevolence* towards the Party, but in great *Benevo-*

[r] Compare Abp. *Tillotſon*, Serm. XXXIII. p. 392. Vol. I. Fol. Edit. *Towerſon* on the Sacraments p. 298.

lence

lence towards Mankind. 2. *Goſpel-forgiveneſs* interferes not with a Perſon's proſecuting his own *juſt* Rights, in a *legal* way, againſt one that has *grievouſly* injured Him in his Eſtate, Perſon, or good Name: For, a Man's barely doing Himſelf *Juſtice*, or recovering a *Right*, is not taking *Revenge*. A Perſon wrongs me, perhaps, of a conſiderable Sum: I forgive Him the *Wrong*, ſo as to bear Him no *Malice*; but I forgive Him not the *Debt*, becauſe I am no way obliged to reſign my own *Property* or *Maintenance* to an injurious Invader. 3. *Goſpel-forgiveneſs* interferes not with a juſt *Averſion* to, or *Abhorrence* of ſome very ill Men; *Liars*, ſuppoſe, *Adulterers*, *Fornicators*, *Extortioners*, *Impoſtors*, *Blaſphemers*, or the like: For ſuch hatred of *Averſion* is a very different Thing from hatred of *Malevolence*, may be without it, and ought to be ſo. We cannot love Monſters of Iniquity with any Love of *Complacency*, neither does God *delight* in them as ſuch: But ſtill we may love them with a Love of *Benevolence* and *Compaſſion*, as God alſo does[f]. 4. Neither does *Goſpel-forgiveneſs* interfere with any proper *Degrees* of Love, or Eſteem. A Man may love his *Enemies* in a juſt Degree, and yet love his *Friends* better, and one Friend *more* than another, in proportion to their *worth*, or *nearneſs*, or other Circumſtances. Our Lord *loved* all his *Diſciples*, even *Judas* not excepted: But He loved one more particularly, who was therefore call- CHAP. XIII.

[f] See *Towerſon* as above, p. 298, 299.

ed

CHAP. XIII.

ed *the Diſciple whom Jeſus loved*[t]; and He loved the reſt with Diſtinction, and in proportionate Degrees. 5. I have before hinted, that *Goſpel-forgiveneſs* interferes not with rejecting Enemies from our *Confidence*, or refuſing to admit them into our Boſoms. We may wiſh them well, pray for them, and do them good; but ſtill at a proper *diſtance*, ſuch as a juſt regard for our own *Safety*, or Reaſons of *Peace*, *Piety*, and *Charity* may require. 6. I may add, that Caſes perhaps may be ſuppoſed, where even the Duty of *praying* for them, may be conceived to ceaſe. *There is a Sin unto Death: I do not ſay, that he ſhall pray for it* [v]. But in this Caſe, They are not to be conſidered merely as *private* Enemies, but as *publick* Nuſances, and as offending of *malicious* Wickedneſs, not againſt *Man* only, but againſt *God* and *Religion*. Indeed, *Charity* forbids us to paſs ſuch a Cenſure, except it be upon *very ſure* Grounds; which perhaps we can but ſeldom, if ever, have: But I was willing to mention this Caſe, for the better clearing up St. *Paul*'s Conduct in this very Article. It may deſerve our Notice, that He *prayed* for thoſe who had meanly, and thro' Human Infirmity, deſerted Him in the Day of Trial, that the *Sin* might not be *laid to their Charge* [w]: In the ſame Breath almoſt, ſpeaking of *Alexander*, a wicked Apoſtate, who had moſt maliciouſly oppoſed *Him*, and the *Goſpel*, He

[t] *John* XIII. 23. XIX, 26. XX. 2. XXI 7, 20.
[v] 1 *John* V. 16.
[w] 2 *Tim.* IV. 16.

ſays;

ſays; *The Lord reward him according to his Works*[x]. He would not *honour* Him ſo far, as to *pray* for his *Converſion*, or *Forgiveneſs*: Or He knew his Caſe to be too deſperate to admit of either. Nevertheleſs, He left the *Vengeance* entirely to *God*, whoſe Right it was; and He took not upon Him ſo much as to *judge* of the *preciſe Degree* of his Demerits, but committed that alſo to the unerring Judgment of God. I am aware, that very conſiderable Divines, ancient and modern, chooſe to reſolve the Caſe another way, either into *Prediction* by the Spirit, or into *Apoſtolical* Authority: But I humbly conceive, that there is no need of either Suppoſition, to reconcile the ſeeming Difficulty. Only, as I before hinted, an *Apoſtle* might better know the *deſperate* State of ſuch a Perſon, than any one can ordinarily know at this Day; and ſo He might proceed upon *ſurer* Grounds: On which Account, his Example is not lightly to be imitated, or to be drawn into a Precedent. Enough, I preſume, has been here ſaid of the Nature, Meaſure and Extent of *Goſpel-forgiveneſs*, and I may now proceed to a new Article of *Sacramental* Preparation. CHAP. XIII.

3. ANOTHER *previous* Qualification, much inſiſted upon by the Ancients[y], was a due regard to *Church Unity* and *publick Peace*, in oppoſition to *Schiſm* in the Church, or *Faction* in the State. The Reaſon and the Obligation of Both is ſelf-evident, and I need not enlarge

[x] 2 *Tim.* IV. 14.
[y] *Bingham*, XV. 8, 11.

upon

CHAP. XIII.

upon it. It may be noted, that the *Corinthians*, whom St. *Paul* reproved, were much wanting in this Article of *Preparation*; as appeared by their Heats and Animoſities, their Sidings and Conteſts. They did not duly conſider this Sacrament as a *Symbol* of *Peace*, a *Feaſt* of *Amity*: They did not *diſcern* the *Lord's Body* to be, what it really is, a *Cement* of *Union*, and a Bond of true Chriſtian Memberſhip, thro' the Spirit.

4. A FOURTH Article was *Mercy* and *Charity* towards the *poor* Brethren [z]. The equity of which is manifeſt: And it is a Duty which has been ſo often and ſo well explained, both from the Preſs and the Pulpit, that I may here ſpare myſelf the Trouble of ſaying a Word more of it.

HAVING ſhewn, firſt, that *Repentance*, at large, is a neceſſary Part of Sacramental Preparation, and having ſhewn alſo of what *Particulars* ſuch Repentance *chiefly* conſiſts (not excluding other Particulars, for Repentance means *entire* Obedience) I may now add, for the preventing groundleſs Scruples, that *Allowances* are always ſuppoſed for *Sins* of *Infirmity*, Sins of *daily Incurſion*, ſuch as are ordinarily conſiſtent with a *prevailing* Love of God, and Love of our Neighbour. The ſlighter kind of Offences ought never to be looked upon as any *Bar* to our *receiving*, but rather as Arguments for receiving, and that *frequently*, in order to gain ground of them more and more, and to have them waſhed off in the ſalutary Blood of Chriſt.

[z] See *Bingham*, XV. 8, 12.

As

As to the length of *Time* to be taken up in preparing, there is no one certain Rule to be given, which can ſuit all Caſes or Circumſtances: Only, when a Man has competently adjuſted his Accounts with God (be it ſooner, or be it later) then is He fit to come, and not till then. There is an *habitual*, and there is an *actual* Preparation. The *habitual* Preparation is a *good Life*; and the farther we are advanced in it, the leſs need there is of any *actual* Preparation beſides: But becauſe Men are too apt to flatter and deceive their *own Hearts*, and to ſpeak *Peace* to themſelves without ſufficient grounds for ſo doing; therefore ſome *actual* Preparation, Self-examination, *&c.* is generally neceſſary even to Thoſe who may be *habitually* good, if it be only to give them a *well grounded* Aſſurance that They really are ſo. However, the better Men are, the leſs actual Preparation may ſuffice, and the ſhorter warning will be needful. Some therefore may receive as often as they have Opportunity, tho' it were ever ſo ſudden, or unexpected; and they may turn it to good account by their pious Care and Recollection in their Cloſets afterwards. Others may have a great deal to conſider of before hand, many Offences to correct, many Diſorders to ſet right, much to do and much to undo, before they preſume to come to God's Altar. CHAP. XIII.

FAULT has been ſometimes found with the little Treatiſes of *Weekly Preparation*, and the like: I think without Reaſon. They are exceeding

CHAP. XIII.

ceeding *uſeful* in their kind; and even their *Number* and *Variety* is an Advantage, conſidering that the Taſtes, Tempers, Neceſſities, Capacities, and outward Circumſtances of Chriſtians are alſo manifold and various. It may be happy for them who need *none* of thoſe Helps: But They that *leaſt* need them, are not the Men, generally, who moſt *deſpiſe* them. However, They are not *obtruded* as Things abſolutely *neceſſary* for *all*, but as highly *uſeful* to *many*, and eſpecially upon their *firſt* receiving: Tho' we are none of us perhaps ſo perfect, as not to want, at ſome Seaſons, ſome ſuch Hints for Recollection, or Helps to Devotion. There may be *Exceſſes*, or there may be *Defects* in ſuch Treatiſes: What *Human* Compoſitions are without them? On the other hand, it ſhould be conſidered, that there may be *Exceſſes*, and *Defects* alſo in the *Cenſures* or *Judgments* paſſed upon them: For *Human* Frailties are as much ſeen to prevail in the Work of *judging* and *cenſuring*, as in any Thing elſe whatſoever. In the general, it is well for common Chriſtians, that They are ſo plentifully provided with uſeful *Manuals* of that kind: They that are well diſpoſed, will make uſe of them as often as they need them, and will at all Times give God Thanks and Praiſes for them.

I HAVE ſaid nothing hitherto, about coming *faſting* to the Lord's Table, neither need I ſay much now. The Rule was *early*, and almoſt *univerſal* [a]; a Rule of the *Church*, not a Rule

[a] *Bingham*, XV. 7, 8. *Gaſpar. Calvoer.* Ritual. Eccleſ. Vol. I. p. 413, &c. *Sam. Baſnag.* Annal. Tom. II. p. 295, &c.

of

of *Scripture*, and ſo a matter of *Chriſtian Liberty*, rather than of ſtrict *Command*. They that uſe it as moſt expreſſive of Chriſtian *Humility* and *Reverence*, or as an Help to *Devotion*, do well; and They that forbear it, either on account of *Infirmity*, or for fear of being *indiſpoſed*, and rendered leſs fit to attend the Service, are not to be blamed. No one need be *ſcrupulous* concerning this matter: None ſhould be *cenſorious* either way; either in raſhly charging *Superſtition* on one hand, or in charging, as raſhly, *Irreverence* on the other. I ſhall only obſerve farther, that it was a weak Thing for ſo great a Man as the juſtly celebrated *Mabillon* to draw an Argument in favour of the *corporal* Preſence, from the cuſtom of the Church in adminiſtring, or receiving this holy Sacrament *faſting*[b]. For, as the Cuſtom, probably, came in accidentally, either becauſe, in Times of Perſecution, Chriſtians choſe to communicate *early* in the *Morning* for their greater *Safety*, or becauſe Abuſes had been committed in the previous *Love Feaſts*; ſo was it continued for the like prudential Reaſons, and then only came to have different Colours put upon it, when the Reaſons which firſt introduced it, were, in a manner, forgotten and ſunk. Beſides, it was the ancient Cuſtom for both the Adminiſtrator and Receiver of *Baptiſm*, to come *faſting*, out of Reverence to That Sacrament[c]:

CHAP. XIII.

[b] *Mabillon* de Liturg. Gallican. Lib. I. cap 6. p. 60, 61.

[c] *Martene* de Antiq. Eccl. Rit. Tom. I. p. 25. The like Rule was afterwards made for *Confirmation*. Vid. p. 237, 239.

CHAP. XIII.

Which further ſhews, how ſlight the Argument is, drawn from the cuſtom of *faſting* before the Euchariſt, as to proving any thing of a *corporal* Preſence. If any Man duly conſidering how *ſacred* thoſe *Symbols* of the Euchariſt are, and to what *high* and *holy* Purpoſes they were ordained, looks upon *faſting* as a proper Token of the *Reverence* He bears towards Things *ſacred*; He may as well faſt upon that Principle, as upon the imaginary Notion of a *corporal*, or *local* Preſence.

I HAVE nothing further to add, upon the Head of Sacramental *Preparation:* But if any one deſires to ſee this Article more minutely drawn out, in its full length, He will not perhaps eaſily find a Treatiſe better fitted to the Purpoſe, than Biſhop *Taylor's Worthy Communicant*[d]: To that therefore I refer the Reader.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Obligation to frequent Communion.

AS to *frequency*, or *conſtancy* in receiving the Sacrament, it may be juſtly ſaid in the general, abſtracting from particular Circumſtances, that a Man cannot *too often* commemorate our Lord and his Paſſion, nor *too often* return devout Thanks and Praiſes for the ſame, nor *too often* repeat his Reſolutions of Amendment, nor *too often* renew his ſolemn Engage-

[d] *Taylor's* Worthy Communicant, Chap. II, III, IV, V, VI. pag. 79 —— 357.

ments, nor *too often* receive Pardon of Sins, and freſh Succours of Divine Grace: And if coming to the Lord's Table (prepared, or unprepared) were a ſure and infallible way to anſwer thoſe good and great Ends, there could then be no queſtion, but that it would be both our Wiſdom and our Duty to communicate as often as Opportunities ſhould invite, and Health permit. But it is certain, on the other hand, that bare *communicating* is not the Thing required, but communicating *worthily*. Here lies the main Streſs of all, not to urge *frequency* of Communion ſo far as to render this holy Sacrament *hurtful*, or *fruitleſs* to the Parties concerned; neither yet to abate ſo far of the *frequency*, as to make a kind of Dearth or Famine of this ſo ſalutary and neceſſary Food. Divines in all Ages of the Church (unleſs we may except the Firſt, and part of the Second) have found ſome Perplexity in ſettling a *juſt mean* between the Extremes. I do not mean as to *Theory*, or as to the Thing conſidered in the *general* and in the *abſtract*, but with reſpect to particular Perſons, Caſes, and Circumſtances; of which it is very difficult, if not impoſſible, to judge with unerring exactneſs. They determined perhaps as well and as wiſely, upon the faireſt Preſumptions and Probabilities, as Human Sagacity in ſuch dark Caſes could do: And if they ſometimes ran into extremes, either on the right hand or on the left, their meaning all the while was good, and their Conduct ſuch as may reaſonably claim all can-

CHAP. XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

did Conſtruction, and the beſt natured Allowances. One Thing is obſervable (and I know not whether one can juſtly blame them for it) that, for the moſt part, They ſeemed inclinable to abate of *frequency*, rather than of the ſtrictneſs of *Preparation* or *Qualification*. They conſidered, that *due Diſpoſitions* were abſolutely neceſſary to make the Sacrament *ſalutary*, and were therefore chiefly to be looked to: And they ſuppoſed, with good reaſon, that God would more eaſily diſpence with the want of the *Sacrament*, than with the want of the *Qualifications* proper for it. They thought farther, that while a Man was content to abſtain from the Lord's Table, out of an *awful Reverence* for it, there was good probability that ſuch a Perſon would, by degrees, be perfectly reclaimed: But if once a Man ſhould ſet light by thoſe *Holy Solemnities*, and irreverently ruſh upon them, without awe or concern, there could be very little hopes of his Converſion or Amendment; becauſe He *deſpiſed* the moſt *ſacred Bands* of Allegiance towards *God*, and looked upon them only as *common* Forms [e]. Such were the prevailing Sentiments of the ableſt Divines and Caſuiſts in thoſe *ancient* Times; as will appear more fully, when I come to give a brief detail of their Reſolutions in this Article, which I ſhall do preſently.

BUT I may firſt take notice, for the clearer Conception of the whole Caſe, that ſince it is allowed on all hands, that there can be no

[e] Vid. *Iſidor. Peluſiot.* Lib. III. Ep. 364. p. 398. alias 345.

juſt

juſt Bar to *frequency* of Communion, but the *want of Preparation*, which is only ſuch a Bar as Men may themſelves remove if they pleaſe, it concerns them highly to take off the Impediment, as ſoon as poſſible, and not to truſt to vain Hopes of alleviating one Fault by another. It was required under the Law, that a Man ſhould come *holy* and *clean*, and well *prepared*[f] to the *Paſſover*: But yet his neglecting to be *clean* (when He might be clean) was never allowed as a juſt Apology for his ſtaying away. No: The abſenting in that Caſe was an Offence great enough to deſerve the being *cut off* from God's People[g], becauſe it amounted to a diſeſteeming, and in effect, diſowning God's *Covenant*. The *danger* of miſperforming any Religious Duty, is an Argument for *Fear* and *Caution*, but no excuſe for *Neglect*: God inſiſts upon the *doing* it, and the doing it *well* alſo. The proper Duty of the High Prieſt, under the Law, was a very *dangerous* employ, requiring the exacteſt *Care* and profoundeſt *Reverence*[h]: Nevertheleſs, there was no declining the Service; neither was the *exactneſs* of the Preparation, or Qualifications any proper excuſe to be pleaded for non-performance. It was no ſufficient Plea for the *ſlothful* Servant, under the Goſpel, that He thought his Maſter hard to pleaſe, and thereupon neglected

CHAP. XIV.

[f] 2 *Chron.* XXX. 1, &c. XXXV. 3, 4, 5, 6, &c.
[g] *Exod.* XII. 15, 19. *Numb.* IX. 13.
[h] *Levit* XVI 13. Conf. *Deyling.* Obſerv. Sacr. Tom. II. n. 41. p. 493. Tom. III. n. 46. p. 454, &c.

CHAP. XIV.

his bounden Duty[i]: For the uſe He ought to have made of that Thought, was, to have been ſo much the more wakeful and diligent in his Maſter's Service. Therefore, in the Caſe of the *Holy Communion*, it is to very little Purpoſe to plead the Strictneſs of the *Self-Examination*, or *Preparation*, by way of excuſe either for a *total*, or for a *frequent*, or for a *long* neglect of it. A Man may ſay, that He comes not to the Table, becauſe He is *not prepared*, and ſo far He aſſigns a *good* Reaſon: But if He ſhould be farther aſked, why He is not *prepared*, when He may; there He can only make ſome trifling, inſufficient Excuſe, or remain ſpeechleſs.

BUT for the farther clearing of this important Article of *frequent Communion*, it may be proper to trace the Judgment and Practice of the Churches of Chriſt, from the Beginning and downwards thro' ſix or or eight Centuries; which I ſhall endeavour to do in as plain and few words, as the nature of the Subject will admit of.

Century the Firſt.

IN the Days of the Apoſtles, Communions were *frequent*; either *every Day*, or at leaſt every *Lord's Day*. Some have probably enough collected from the Hiſtory of the *Acts*, that at *Jeruſalem*, the Mother Church, there was a *daily* Communion[k], and that in other Churches

[i] *Matt.* XXV. 24, &c. *Luke* XIX. 20, &c.
[k] *Acts* II. 42, 46.

the

the Cuſtom was to have *weekly* Communions at leaſt, that is to ſay, upon the *Lord's Day*[l]. But all muſt be underſtood of Perſons *fitly prepared*, to appearance at leaſt: For it is certain, that open *Fornicators*, *Extortioners*, *Idolaters*, and the like, were not admitted to Communion. Chriſtians were not allowed to *keep Company* with ſuch Delinquents, no not to *eat* common Meals[m]; much leſs to *communicate*. St. *Paul* gave orders for excommunicating the *inceſtuous* Corinthian[n]; and He admitted Him not again, 'till after a very ſerious and ſolemn Repentance, after his being almoſt *ſwallowed up of Grief*[o]. However, it is obſervable, that both his *Excluſion* and his *Readmiſſion* were within the compaſs of a Twelvemonth: For St. *Paul*'s two Epiſtles to *Corinth* are judged to bear date the ſame Year, namely, *A. D.* 57. Such are the Apoſtolical Precedents for *frequent* Communion if *prepared*, and for *abſtaining* if *not prepared*.

CHAP. XIV.

Century the Second.

IN the next Century we have undoubted Evidences of *weekly* Communions, and particularly on the *Lord's Day*. This is juſtly collected from the Teſtimony of the younger *Pliny* above cited[p], and is plainly declared by *Juſtin Martyr*[q], of the ſame Century. None

[l] *Acts* XX. 7. [m] 1 *Cor.* V. 11, 12. Compare 2 *John* 10.
[n] 1 *Cor.* V. 5, 13. [o] 2 *Cor.* II. 6, 7. [p] See above, Ch. I. p. 40.
[q] Τῇ τῦ ἡλίυ λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, κ. τ. λ. *Juſt. Mart.* Apol. I. p. 97.

CHAP. XIV.

but true *Believers* and Men of *good Lives* were permitted to receive, as I before obſerved[†] from the ſame excellent Writer: So that *frequency* of communicating was never urged in derogation of the *preparatory* Requiſites, or to make any Abatement in them. As to *publick* and *ſcandalous* Offences, in Faith or Manners, thoſe the Church could ſee, and provide againſt, by debarring the Offenders from Communion: And as to *ſecret* Impediments, They took what care they could, by permitting or exhorting ſuch as might be conſcious of their own unfitneſs, to forbear coming to the Altar. There is a remarkable Paſſage to this purpoſe, in a learned Writer of the Second Century, which runs thus: "Some, after the cuſtomary diviſion "of the Elements, leave it upon the *Conſciences* "of their People, either to take their Part, or "otherwiſe. For the beſt Rule to determine "them in their Participation or Forbearance, "is their *own Conſcience:* And the ſureſt Foun- "dation for Conſcience to proceed upon, is "a *good Life*, joined with a competent mea- "ſure of Proficiency in *Chriſtian Knowledge*. "And the beſt Method of coming at the "Knowledge of the *Truth*, and a *right Per- "formance* of what is commanded, is to chooſe "for your direction Perſons of moſt *approved* "Faith and Conduct. For whoſoever ſhall "eat this Bread and drink this Cup of the "Lord *unworthily*, ſhall be *guilty* of the Body "and Blood of the Lord: But let a Man

[†] See above, Ch. XIII. p. 540.

"examine

" examine Himſelf, and ſo let Him eat of the " Bread, and drink of the Cup[r]." Thus far *Clemens*. And from thence we may obſerve, that there was yet no ſtanding Rule or Canon of the Church, obliging all the Faithful to *receive* as often as they met for Divine Service; but Chriſtians were left at liberty to judge how far they were fitly *qualified* in Knowledge, or in Godly Living: Only, it was ſuppoſed, that They ought to be *fitly* qualified; and if they were, to *receive*. CHAP. XIV.

Tertullian, who lived in the cloſe of the ſame Century, takes notice of Some who declined *receiving*, upon the *ſtationary* Days (Wedneſdays and Fridays) for fear of breaking their *Faſt*[s]. He blames them for their fooliſh Scruple, and ſuggeſts to them a better way, whereby They might keep both their *Faſt* and their *Feaſt*. I may obſerve from it, that He thought it a *Duty* incumbent upon all the Faithful, to *communicate* as often as they might; but the Church had not yet enforced the Duty with any *Canons*, obliging them under Pain of Eccleſiaſtical *Cenſure* to *receive*: For, had that been the caſe, *Tertullian*, probably, would have mentioned it; or rather, there would ſcarce have been room left either for their *Scruples* on one hand, or for his charitable *Advice* on the other. However, from hence perhaps we may date the firſt Beginnings of that *coldneſs* and *backwardneſs* in point of *frequent* Communion, which grew up

[r] *Clem. Alex.* Strom. I. p. 318.
[s] *Tertullian.* de Orat. cap. 14. p. 136.

apace

CHAP. XIV.

apace amongſt Chriſtians afterwards: It is not certain that thoſe Perſons were *ſincere* in their pretended Scruples; but they might be willing to ſhift off the Duty as decently as they could, under the faireſt Colours.

Century the Third.

St. *Cyprian*, who flouriſhed upout the middle of the Third Century, mentions *daily* Communions, as the common Practice of that Time[u]: And He every where ſpeaks highly of the *Uſe* and *Benefit* of the Sacrament to the *worthy* Receivers: But no Man could be more careful to prevent any one's coming to the Lord's Table, who had committed any of the *grievous* Sins, and had not yet made full *Satisfaction* to God and the World, by a ſtrict and ſolemn Repentance.

IN this Century crept in ſome ſuperſtitious, or over-curious Conceits about *legal* Defilements[w], as a Bar to *Communion*, or even to coming to the Chriſtian Aſſemblies. Such Niceties, while they carried a Show of Reverence for *holy* Places and Things, might notwithſtanding have better been let alone; having no warrant in the Goſpel of Chriſt, nor in the Practice of the earlier Ages of the Church, ſo far as appears: Neither indeed were they altogether conſiſtent with the ancient Cuſtom of *daily* Communions of all the Faithful,

[u] See the whole Paſſage above, Ch. VI. p. 167, 168.

[w] Vid. *Canones Dionyſ. Alexandrin.* *Harduin.* Tom. I. p. 187, &c. *Bevereg.* Pandect. Tom. II. p. 4, &c.

which

which had obtained in ſome Churches. One Thing is obſervable, that during the firſt *three Centuries*, we meet with no *Canons* made to enforce *frequent* Communion, ſcarce ſo much as *Exhortations* to it, or any *Complaints* of neglect in that Article: Which is an Argument that Chriſtians in thoſe Times were not *tardy* in that reſpect, but rather forward and preſſing, under an high Notion of the *Privilege* and *Comfort* of partaking of the Holy Communion. Therefore the chief care and concern of Church Guides, during the firſt Ages, was rather to inculcate the neceſſity of *due Preparation*, than to inſiſt upon *frequency*, for which there was leſs occaſion. But Times and Circumſtances ſoon came to be altered; as we ſhall ſee preſently, upon taking a view of the following Centuries.

Century the Fourth.

IN the Year 305 (ſome ſay, 300, or 303, or 313, or 324) was held a Council of Nineteen Biſhops, at *Eliberis*, or *Elvira*, in *Andaluſia*, a Province of *Spain*. Among many other Canons, a Rule was then made, not to accept of an *Offering* from one who did not *communicate*[x]. We may judge from hence, that Chriſtians now began to be *remiſs*, with reſpect to *Communion*, and that ſuch *Canon* was intended for a gentle Rebuke to them; a Mark of publick Diſfavour, in order to excite and

[x] Epiſcopos, placuit, ab eo qui *non communicat*, munera accipere non debere. *Concil. Illiberit.* Can. XXVIII. Harduin. 153.

quicken

CHAP. XIV.

quicken them, firſt to *prepare*, and then to *receive*. Many perhaps might now grow cold and careleſs as to coming to the Lord's Table; either becauſe they had not a juſt Senſe of the *Uſe* and *Benefit* of it, and of the *Obligations* they were under to it; or they loved the World too well, and were willing to put off their *Repentance* from day to day, and ſo of courſe to ſtave off that *ſolemn Profeſſion* which the Holy Sacrament required. The like coldneſs and backwardneſs appeared in many of that Age, even with reſpect to *Baptiſm*[y]: For, while they were well-wiſhers to it, and ſtood Candidates for it, they yet loved to procraſtinate and to feign excuſes; becauſe delaying *Baptiſm* was delaying *Repentance*, which depraved Nature was prone enough to do. The caſe, very probably, was much the ſame with reſpect to this other *Sacrament*: And hence aroſe that *Coldneſs* towards it, which the Church-Guides of thoſe Times were much concerned at, and endeavoured gently to remove.

WHEN thoſe milder Applications did not ſufficiently anſwer, ſome briſker methods were thought on for the compaſſing the ſame good end. In the Year 341, a Council of *Antioch* decreed, "That all they who came to Church, "and heard the Holy Scriptures read, and af- "terwards joined not in *Prayer* with the People,

y Vid. *Baſil.* Homil. in Sanct. Bapt. p. 114, &c. Edit. Bened. Tom II. *Gregor Nazianz.* Orat. XL. p. 647, &c. *Conſtit. Apoſtol.* Lib. VI. cap. 15. *Gregor Nyſſen.* de Baptiſm. opp. Tom. III. p. 216, &c. Compare *Bingham.* XI. 6. 2. 3. &c.

"or

" or turned their Backs on the *Holy Communion*, CHAP. " after a diſordely way, ſhould be caſt out of XIV. " the Church, 'till ſuch time as They ſhould " make publick Confeſſion of their Fault, and " give Proofs of their Repentance, and humbly " ſue to be reconciled[z]." This Rule may ſeem to be a *ſevere* Rule, on more accounts than one. 1. As it appears to run in *general* Terms, making no expreſs Exceptions for thoſe who, for *juſt* Cauſes, beſt known to themſelves, might ſometimes decline *receiving*. 2. Suppoſing any Perſon to abſent from the Lord's Table, out of *Reverence* to it (being conſcious to Himſelf of ſome *ſecret* Offences) as it was a Rule of the Church to excommunicate no Man but for *open* and *ſcandalous* Sins, it might look hard to excommunicate merely for not receiving *conſtantly*; becauſe it was, in effect, extending Diſcipline even to the moſt *private* and *concealed* Offences, or to other impediments. 3. Since no one ought to *receive* but He that ſincerely *repents*; and ſince Repentance muſt be *free*, or it is really no Repentance; it appears not right to excommunicate a Man, in order to oblige Him to *receive*, unleſs it were right alſo to excommunicate every one who ſhould delay *Repentance*, or who would not inſtantly be perſuaded to *reform*, ſo far as to be capable of receiving *worthily*

[z] Πάντας τὰς, εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δὲ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποτρεπομένους τὴν ἁγίαν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καλά τινα ἀταξίαν, τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἕως ἂν ἐξομολογησάμενοι καὶ δείξαντες καρποὺς μετανοίας, καὶ προσκαλέσαντες τυχεῖν δωρεᾶς συγγινώμης. *Concil. Antioch.* Can. 2. *Bevereg. Pand.* pag. 431.

the

CHAP. XIV.

the Holy Communion. This appears not to have been the Rule of the earlier Centuries: For, they left Men at liberty to judge (except in caſes of open Scandal) how far they were *worthy* or otherwiſe, and thereupon to chooſe either to *receive* or *forbear*. Theſe or the like Reaſons, I preſume, have put learned Men upon ſoftening Explications, to mitigate the Rigour of the *Canon*. *Emanuel Schelſtrate* has ſuggeſted, that the Order then made pointed chiefly at the *Audians*, or *Quarto-decimans*[a], who held private Conventicles, but came occaſionally to Church, to hear the Scriptures read, and Sermons preached, and then departed, in a diſorderly and ſcornful manner, upon ſome erroneous Principles of their Sect, to the great Scandal and Offence of the more ſerious and ſober Part of the Congregation. *Schelſtrate*'s Account is favoured by two Circumſtances: One, that the Canon immediately preceding, moſt plainly ſtrikes at the *Quarto-decimans*, tho' without naming them; and the other, that the Canon does not *ſimply* and *abſolutely* cenſure *all* Non-Communicants, but *ſome* only, with this *Reſtriction*, as doing it κατά τινα ἀταξίαν, which *Dionyſius Exiguus* renders *pro quadam Intemperantia*, with a *certain Rudeneſs*; and *Iſidorus Mercator* renders *ſecundum aliquam propriam diſciplinam*, *according to the Principles of their own Sect*. Now, if ſuch was the Caſe, then the Rigour of the Canon affected not the main Body of the Faithful, adhering to the Church, who might be ſtill left

[a] Vid. *Schelſtrate* de Concil. Antiochen. p. 179, 222.

to

to the ſame diſcretionary conſcientious Liberty as before. CHAP. XIV.

PERHAPS the like Account may ſerve for the *Apoſtolical Canons* alſo, ſo far as concerns this Article: *Schelſtrate* was of that mind, and applied the ſame Solution to both[b]. One of the *Apoſtolical Canons* orders, "That if any "Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, or any of the Sa- "cerdotal College, does not *communicate* when "there is a *Communion* [*Oblation*] He ſhall be "obliged to aſſign a *Reaſon*; and if it be a "*juſt* one, He ſhall be excuſed: Otherwiſe He "ſhall be *ſuſpended*, as giving offence to the "People, and as raiſing a Suſpicion upon the "*Adminiſtrator*, as if He did not *ſalutarily* "execute his Office[c]." The laſt Words put me in mind of the IVth Canon of the Council of *Gangra*, held a few Years before the *Antiochian*: Some place it in 324, ſome in 330; All agree, that it was not later than 340. That Canon decrees, "That if any one takes excep- "tion to a *married* Preſbyter, as ſuch, think- "ing it not lawful to receive the *Communion* "at his Hands, let Him be Anathema[d]." Whether the *Antiochian* and *Apoſtolical* Canons

[b] *Schelſtrate*, ibid. p. 222.

[c] Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τῶν καταλόγου τῶν ἱερατικῶν, τῶν προσφορῶν γινομένης, μὴ μεταλαμβάνοι, τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπάτω· καὶ ἐὰν μὲν λύσιμος ᾖ, συγγνώμης τυγχανέτω· εἰ δὲ μὴ λέγοι, ἀφοριζέσθω, ὡς αἴτιος βλάβης γενηθεὶς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ ὑπόνοιαν ἐμποιήσας καὶ τῷ προσφέροντι, ὡς μὴ ὑγιῶς ἀνενέγκοντι. *Can. Apoſtol.* VI. alias VIII.

[d] Εἴ τις παροικοίη τῷ ἰδίῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ γαμικῷ, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι, λειτουργοῦντι αὐτῷ, προσφορᾶς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Concil. Gangrenſ. Can. IV. Hard. pag. 530. *Bevereg.* Pand. Tom. I. 419.

might

CHAP. XIV.

might not have ſome view to that Caſe, in what they decreed againſt any one's turning his Back on the Communion, I leave to the Learned to conſider.

THE next *Canon* called *Apoſtolicai* makes a like order with reſpect to the *Laity*, as the former had done with regard to the *Clergy*: viz. "That as many of the Faithful as came to "Church, and did not abide all the Time of the "*Prayer* and *Communion*, ſhould be excommuni-"cated, as guilty of raiſing diſturbance in the "Church[e]." It is hard to judge certainly of the particular drift or purport of ſuch Canons, without a more explicite Knowledge of the then preſent Circumſtances: But it is not likely that they were ever intended to oblige all the Faithful to communicate as often as They came to Divine Service, or to abridge them of the reaſonable Liberty of judging how far they were *prepared* for it, and whether They might not ſometimes (provided it were not cuſtomary, ſo as to amount to *contempt*) abſtain from it. *Balſamon*, in his Notes upon the *Apoſtolical Canon* laſt cited, calls it a very *harſh Decree*[f]: And ſo indeed it is, if interpreted with utmoſt rigour. But He intimates elſewhere, that the Greek Church in his Time received it with a *ſoftening* Explication[g]. *Schel-*

[e] Πάντας τὰς εἰσιόντας πιστὰς εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὴν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκρόασιν, μὴ παραμένοντας ἕως τῆς προσευχῆς καὶ τῆς ἁγίας μεταλήψεως, ὡς ἀταξίαν ἐμποιοῦντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή. *Can. Apoſtol.* VII. alias IX.

[f] Διορισμὸς δεινότατός ἐστιν. *Balſam.* in loc.

[g] Vid. *Beveregii* Annot. in Apoſt. Can. IX. p. 21.

ſtrate,

ſtrate, as before noted, has ſuggeſted another; and to Both I have taken the Liberty to ſubjoin a Third. It is not reaſonable to think, that a modeſt and ſober Departure, before Communion began (a Practice now common, and, I believe, always in uſe, more or leſs) could be looked upon as a *Diſturbance*: But if it was done out of *diſlike*, or *contempt*, and upon *factious* Principles, then indeed it would be apt to make *great Diſturbance*; and That, very probably, was what the Compilers of thoſe *Canons* were ſolicitous to prevent or remedy. But I return. CHAP. XIV.

I PROCEED in reciting the Principles of the *Fourth* Century, with regard to *frequent* Communion. *Baſil* (about the Year 372.) being conſulted on this Head, declares it good and profitable to communicate *every Day*; teſtifying withal, of the Practice of the Church of *Cæſarea*, where He was, that They celebrated the Sacrament *four* Times a Week (on *Sunday*, *Wedneſday*, *Friday*, and *Saturday*) beſides the *Saints Days* [Feſtivals of Martyrs] as often as they occurred [h]: But He does not ſay how diligent or how conſtant the People were in attending upon it.

Chryſoſtom, of the ſame Century, ſomewhat later, will give us the beſt Light, both with reſpect to the *Practice* of that Age, and the *Rules* whereby it was conducted. In one Place of his Works, He ſpeaks thus: "Many par-

[h] *Baſil.* Epiſt. 93. (alias 289.) p. 186. Ed. Bened. Tom. III. conf. *Socrat.* Eccl. Hiſtor. Lib. V. c. 22.

CHAP. XIV.

" take of this Sacrifice *once* a Year, ſome *twice*, " ſome *oftner*. —— Which of them ſhould " we moſt approve of? Thoſe that communi- " cate *once*, or thoſe that do it *often*, or thoſe " that *ſeldom* do it? Neither the *once-comers*, " nor the *often*, nor the *ſeldom*, but thoſe that " come with a *clean Conſcience*, a *pure Heart*, " and a *Life unblameable*. They that are ſo " qualified, ſhould come *conſtantly*: But as to " Them that are not, *once* is too much for " them. And why ſo? Becauſe they will only " receive to themſelves *Judgment* and *Con-* " *demnation*, *Pains*, and *Penalties* [i]." Here we may obſerve how this good Father preſſed upon his Hearers the Duty of *conſtant* Communion, but under Caution of coming *fitly prepared:* Otherwiſe He thought, it would not be barely *fruitleſs*, but *hurtful*. That was the ſtanding Rule of the Church, the ſettled Principle which They conſtantly went upon, with reſpect to *Both Sacraments*. For, whatever high Notions they might entertain of the *Uſe* or *Neceſſity* of *Baptiſm*, yet they never would encourage any Perſon to receive it, before they believed Him well *qualified* for it; but would ſometimes keep the *Catechumens* back, for five or ten, or twenty Years, or even to the Hour of Death, rather than admit them in a State of *Impenitence*, or before they had been well diſciplined and proved [k]. Sacraments were a good *Superſtructure:* But the *Foundation* was

[i] *Chryſoſtom.* in Hebr. Hom. XVII. p. 856. Edit. Pariſ.
[k] See *Teſtimonies* referred to in *Bingham*, XI. 6. 1.

firſt

firſt and principally to be looked to, the Foun- CHAP.
dation of *Repentance* and a *good Life*. Qualifi- XIV.
cations ought to go before Admiſſion: and *Ser-*
vice before *Privileges*. But I paſs on.

Chryſoſtom, in another Homily, reproves the *Non-Communicants*, and preſſes *frequent* Communion in the Manner here following: "In "vain ſtand we at the *Altar*, none come to *re-* "*ceive*. I ſpeak not barely to perſuade you to "*receive*, but to make yourſelves *worthy*. You "are not *worthy* [you'll ſay] of the *Sacrifice*, "or not fit to receive? Then neither are you "worthy of *the Prayer:* Do you not hear the "*Deacon*, when He ſtands up and proclaims: "*As many among you as are under Penance*, "*withdraw?* All that do not communicate, are "ſuppoſed to be under Penance. If you are "of the Number of *Penitents*, you muſt not "receive: For, He that does not receive, is "under *Penance*. Why does He [the Deacon] "ſay, *all ye that cannot pray, depart?* And why "do you, after that, impudently ſtay? You are "not one of Thoſe, you'll ſay, but of Thoſe "who may receive. Have you then no Re- "gard for That, or do you think it a ſlight "Privilege? Conſider, I beſeech you, *&c.* —— "Every one that does not partake of the My- "ſteries, is ſhameleſs and impudent to ſtand "by all the while. —— You ſing the *Hymn* "with the reſt, and you profeſs yourſelf one "of the *worthy*, by your not departing with "the *unworthy*. With what Face then can you "preſume to *ſtay*, and yet not partake of the

CHAP. XIV.

" Table? You plead, you are *unworthy*: You " are therefore unworthy to joyn in the *Pray-* " *ers*, for the Holy Spirit deſcends, not only " in the offering of the *Elements*, but alſo in " the chanting of the *Hymns* [1]." *Chryſoſtom* here pleads for *frequent* Communion, in a ſtrong affecting way, but ſtill loſes not Sight of the main Point, which was the receiving *worthily*.

The Argument He draws from *Prayer* to *Communion*, has been ſometimes miſunderſtood, and may here deſerve to be ſet right. He does not mean that *Prayer* in general requires the ſame Preparation that the *Communion* does, or that every one who may properly be admitted to the former, may as properly be admitted to the latter alſo. No: That would run directly counter to the known Principles and Practice, and ſtanding Diſcipline of the Church in that Age: For, nothing was more uſual than to admit *Penitents*, of the *fourth Order*, to *Communion in Prayers*, for 2, 3, 4, or ſometimes;

[1] *Chryſoſt.* in Epheſ. Hom. III. p. 887, 888.

N. B. The Communion-Hymns are by *Goar* (Euchol. p. 136.) diſtinguiſhed into four:

1. ὕμνος ἀγγελικὸς. The Angelical. *Glory to God on High*, &c.
2. ὕμνος χερουβικὸς. The *Cherubical* Hymn, in *Goar* p. 106.
3. ὕμνος τρισαγίου. *Sanctus Deus, Sanctus fortis*, &c.
4. ὕμνος ἐπινίκιος. The *Triumphal* Hymn. *Holy, Holy, Holy*, Lord, &c. *Iſa.* VI. 3.

But the Firſt and Fourth are the moſt ancient: The Second and Third are both later than *Chryſoſtom*. The three laſt are but one *Triſagium* in the main, one *Cherubical*, or *Seraphical* Hymn, with ſome Variations, Additions, and Interpolations made at different Times. See *Bingham*, XIV. 2, 3. XV. 3. 9, 10. *Allix.* Diſſert. de Triſagii Origine. *Renaudot.* Liturg. Collect. Tom. I. p. 228. Tom. II. p. 69.

Years,

Years, and all the while to debar them from the *Holy Communion*, as not yet *worthy* to be admitted to it [m]. But what *Chryſoſtom* meant was, that it was very abſurd, and even downright impudent, for a Man to claim a Right to ſtand by, all the while that the *Communion* was adminiſtring, and to *join* in thoſe moſt *ſacred* and *myſtical* Prayers and *Hymns*, which were *proper* to it, and at the ſame Time to pretend that He was not *worthy* of it: For, if He really was not worthy to *receive*, He was not worthy to be *preſent* during that Holy Solemnity, or to bear a Part in the *Prayers* which peculiarly belonged to it. I know, it has been thought by Perſons of good Learning, that the *Fourth* Order of Penitents (called συνιστάμενοι, *conſiſtentes*, in Engliſh *Co-ſtanders*, or *Aſſociates*) were allowed to be *preſent* during the *whole* Solemnity, while prohibited from *receiving*, and that Sunday after Sunday, for ſeveral Years together: Which would have been committing that very *Abſurdity* which *Chryſoſtom* here ſo ſtrongly remonſtrates againſt. But I take that prevailing Notion to be all a Miſtake, owing to the want of a right Underſtanding the antient *Canons*, and ancient *Phraſes*. Thoſe *Co-ſtanders* were allowed to communicate in *Prayers* with the Faithful [n]. What Prayers is the Queſtion.

CHAP. XVI.

[m] *Concil. Ancyran.* Can. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. 16. 24.
Concil. Nicen. Can 11, 12, 13.
Baſil Can. 22. 30. 56, 57, 58, 59. 61. 66. 75. 82, 83.
Concil. Carthag. VI. Can. 11.
Concil. Trull. Can. 87.

[n] Εὐχῆς ϗ μόνης κοινωνῆσαι. Concil. Ancyr. Can. 4. Κοινωνῆσαι

CHAP. XIV.

I ſuppoſe the Prayers *previous* to the Holy Kiſs, *previous* alſo to the *Oblation*; which were indeed part of the *Miſſa Fidelium*, or *Communion Service* (like to our *Prayer* for the *Church Militant*) but were not the proper *myſtical* Prayers belonging to the *Communion*, and of which *Chryſoſtom* is to be underſtood. The *Co-ſtanders*, being the higheſt Order of *Penitents*, had the Privilege to *ſtand* in the ſame Place of the Church with the *Faithful*, and to *abide* there, after the *Catechumens* and lower Penitents were diſmiſſed; and they were permitted to *communicate in Prayer*, till the *Oblation* began, and then They alſo were to withdraw. This I collect, as from ſeveral other Circumſtances, ſo particularly from hence, that the Deacons juſt before the *Salutation* of Peace, warned all *Non-Communicants* to withdraw °. The *Co-ſtanders* muſt of courſe have been reckoned of that Number, being forbid to communicate; and therefore They muſt have been obliged to withdraw after the *preparatory* Prayers, and before

χωρὶς προσφορᾶς. Ibid. Can. 6. So in the *Nicene* Canons, and *Baſil's*, &c.

All that did not depart with the *Catechumens*, after the Goſpel, or with the *Penitents* ſoon after, *communicated in Prayer*, as appears by the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*. Μὴ κοινωνείτωταν ὁ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, ἀλλ' ἐξερχέσθωσαν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν καὶ νόμιμα καὶ τὰ προφητῶν καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Lib. II. c. 39. The Council of *Laodicea* diſtinctly mentions what *Prayers* preceded the *Oblation*. Can. 19. p. 786. Harduin.

° Ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἀναφορᾷ, ὁ Διάκονος προσφωνεῖ πρὸ τοῦ ἁπάντων οἱ ἀκοινώνητοι προσεπατήσατε. *Timoth.* Alex. Reſp. IX. 1104. Hard. Οἱ τὰ πρώτια οὐχὶ οὐχόμενοι, προελθέτε. Apoſt. Conſtitut. Lib. VIII. c. 12. Si quis non communicat, det locum. *Gregor.* M. Dial. Lib. II. c. 23.

the

the *Communion*, properly ſpeaking, began. *Chryſoſtom* Himſelf intimates in another *Homily*, that all *Non-Communicants* were warned to depart [p]; and that preſently after came on the myſtical *Hymn*. About that Time, the *Co-ſtanders*, as I conceive, withdrew. Neither, indeed, is it credible, that ſo knowing a Perſon as *Chryſoſtom* would have repreſented it as a flaming Abſurdity for a *Non-Communicant* to be preſent during the *whole* Solemnity, had the Cuſtom of the Church allowed it in the *Co-ſtanders*, who were Non-Communicants. CHAP. XIV.

IT may be objected, that Pope *Siricius* (about *A. D.* 385.) allowed, or ordered ſome *Non-Communicants* to abide till the *whole Service* was over [q]: And *Sozomen* ſpeaks of the Cuſtom of the Weſtern Churches, as obliging the Penitents to wait all the Time of the *Communion Service*, in order to receive the Biſhop's Abſolution after it was *ended* [r]. Theſe are the principal Paſſages which have led learned Men into a Perſuaſion, that the *Co-ſtanders* were uſed to be *preſent* during the *whole Solemnity*. But they did not obſerve, that the *preparatory* Ser-

[p] Μὴ τις τῶν κατηχουμένων, μὴ τις τῶν μὴ ἐσθιόντων, μὴ τις τῶν κατασκόπων, μή τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων θεάσασθαι τὸ μόχον ἐσθιόμενον. —— μή τις ἀναξιῶν τῆς ζώσης θυσίας, &c. *Chryſoſt.* Homil. de Fil. Prod. Tom. VI. p. 375. Pariſ.

[q] Diximus decernendum, ut *Sola* intra Eccleſiam Fidelibus *Oratione* jungantur; *Sacris myſteriorum celebritatibus*, quamvis non mereantur, *interſint*; a Dominicæ autem Menſæ convivio ſegregentur, &c. *Siric.* Epiſt. p. 848. Harduin.

[r] Πληρωθείσης τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ λειτουργίας. Sozom. Lib. VII. c. 16. p. 300. Edit. Cant.

CHAP. XIV. vice was called The *Service*, or The *Maſs*, and that the *Communion*, properly, began not, till that Service was ended, and the Non-Communicants were withdrawn. *Gregory Turonenſis* of the Sixth Century, may help to clear this matter: He ſpeaks of the *Communion's* beginning, after the *Maſſes*, or *Liturgies* were ended[f]. *Cyprian*, long before, ſpake much after the ſame way[t]. And even *Juſtin Martyr*, has made mention of the *common* Prayers, as *ended*, before the Communion began, before the Holy *Salutation*: And ſoon after He takes notice of the ſubſequent *Prayers* and *Thankſgivings* proper to the Communion[v]. Thoſe ſubſequent Prayers were what *Chryſoſtom* ſpake of, as altogether improper for any to join in, or to be preſent at, except the *Communicants* themſelves.

A learned Writer of our own obſerves, that "what in *Chryſoſtom's* Time, was reckoned a "Crime, was preſently after accounted a Piece "of Devotion, for the People to ſtay and hear "the *whole Solemnity* of the Service, till the "Time of communicating, and then they might

[f] Ubi *peractis ſolemnibus*, ad Sacroſanctum Altarium communicandi gratia acceſſiſſet, &c. *Gregor.* Turon. Lib. IX. N. 3. p. 419. Cumque *expletis miſſis*, Populus cœpiſſet Sacroſanctum Corpus Redemptoris accipere. *Greg. Turon.* de Mirac. Martin. Lib. II. c. 47. p. 1069 conf. *Mabillon.* de Liturg. Gallican. p. 35, 36. 51.

[t] Ubi verò *ſollennibus adimpletis*, Calicem Diaconus offerre præſentibus cœpit, &c. *Cyprian.* de Lapſ. p. 132. Edit. Oxon.

[v] Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα, πωυσάμενοι τὸν δύχαν· ἔπειτα προστρέχει τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος, καὶ κράματος. Καὶ δίδωσιν λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει. *Juſtin. Mart.* Apol. 1. p. 95, 96. Edit. Thirlb.

" depart

« depart without partaking of the Communion: « Which was plainly a Relaxation of the ancient Diſcipline, and a Deviation from the « Primitive Practice[w]." For this He refers to the Council of *Agde* of the Year 506, and to the firſt Council of *Orleans* in 511. I take not upon me to defend what was done in later Times, but to clear *Chryſoſtom*'s Argument, as conſonant to the Principles and Practice of that Age with reſpect to *Non-Communicants*; whether *Co-ſtanders* or others. However, I muſt obſerve with reſpect even to the Councils of *Agde* and *Orleans*, that no Order was made for *Non-Communicants* to ſtay during the *whole Solemnity* of the Communion: Only, they were obliged to wait for the Biſhop's *Benediction* (which was *previous*[x] to the moſt *ſolemn* Part of the Service) and then to depart. So that tho' the Diſmiſſion of the *Non-Communicants* might perhaps be deferred ſomewhat later now, than in *Chryſoſtom*'s Time, yet diſmiſſed They were before the *Communion* properly came on; and the *Abſurdity* which *Chryſoſtom* complained of, That of ſtaying out the *whole Solemnity* without communicating, never was admitted in thoſe Days.

CHAP. XIV.

THE principal uſe I had in view, by what I have here ſaid, was to take off a kind of popular Plea, which has been ſometimes urged in the Name of *Chryſoſtom*, that every one who

[w] *Bingham*, XV. 4. 2.

[x] Vid. *Bona*. de Reb. Liturg. Lib. II. c. 16. n. 1, 2. p. 664, &c. *Mabillon*. de Liturg. Gallic. Lib. I. c. 4. n. 14. p. 35. *Calvoer*. Ritual. Eccleſiaſt. Vol. I. p. 713. *Bingham*, XV. 3. 28, 29.

CHAP. XVI.

may be admitted to *Prayers*, ought to be admitted to *Communion* alſo; and that there is no more reaſon for abſenting from the *Communion*, on account of *unfitneſs*, than there is for abſenting from *Prayers* on the like Account: For, it is pleaded, that either a Man is fit for *Both*, or for *Neither*. *Chryſoſtom* never *ſaid*, or moſt certainly never *meant* any ſuch Thing: So that his *Authority* ought to be out of the Queſtion. As to the *Reaſon* of the Caſe, the Plea can never hold upon that foot. It is true, *Prayer* requires ſome *Preparation*; and a Man may pray *unworthily*, as well as communicate *unworthily:* And his Prayer, in ſuch Circumſtances, may be vain and fruitleſs[y]. But yet it is no where ſaid, that He who prays unworthily, ſhall be *guilty of the Body and Blood* of the Lord, or that He ſhall draw down *Judgment* upon Himſelf, by doing it. Neither is all Prayer ſo ſacred and ſolemn as *Sacramental* Prayer, nor is any mere Prayer a *federal* Rite, like a *Sacrament:* Nor does the want of due Preparation in Prayer (tho' a culpable neglect) ſo directly tend to fruſtrate the moſt *ſacred Ties*, and to turn all Religion into *Hypocriſy* and *Form*, as the want of it in the other Caſe does: Therefore, the two Caſes are by no means *parallel*, but *ſimilar* only, and that in great diſproportion. And hence it was (as I before hinted) that the Ancients, while they admitted *Catechumens* to ſome *Prayers*, proper to them, and the lower degrees of *Penitents* to *Prayers*

[y] *Prov.* XV. 8. *Iſa.* I. 15.

proper

proper for them, and the higheſt Order of Penitents to ſome part of the *Communion-Prayers*, as not improper for them, yet they debarred even the beſt of them, ſometimes Month after Month, or Year after Year, as not yet *worthy* to receive the Holy Communion. CHAP. XIV.

I MAY now proceed ſomewhat farther with *Chryſoſtom*. In another Homily, after He had been ſpeaking of the *Danger* of receiving *unworthily*, He adds: "I ſpeak not this to deter you "from coming, but from coming *careleſsly*. "For, as there is *danger* in coming careleſsly, "ſo there is *Famine* and *Death* in the not par-"taking at all of the *myſtical* Supper. This "Table is, as it were, the *Sinews* of our Souls, "the girding up of the Mind, the Support of "our Confidence; our Hope, our Health, our "Light, our Life[z]." Here the eloquent Father ſeems to make it not ſo bad to receive *unworthily*, as to forbear receiving at all: For, He repreſents the one as *dangerous*, the other as *fatal*. If ſo, the *unworthy Non-Communicant* would be in a worſe Condition than the *unworthy Communicant*; and it would be *ſafeſt* to receive at all Adventures: And if that were admitted, it would be hard to juſtify the ancient *Diſcipline* with reſpect to either *Sacrament*. But here we muſt anſwer with Diſtinction. Suppoſing the *unworthineſs* equal in Both, there is equally *Contempt* in both Caſes, but not *equal* Contempt; for the unworthy *Communicant* is guilty of a *greater* Contempt than the other,

[z] *Chryſoſtom.* in 1 Cor. X. Hom. XXV. p. 262.

and

CHAP. XIV.

and is the moſt *profane* of the two, incurring *greater* Damnation. As it were *better* not to have known the way of Life, than to go counter to it [a], ſo it were *better* never to take the Sacrament, than to *profane* it as conſtantly as we take it. So then, to neglect it out of Contempt, is indeed *Famine* and *Death:* But ſtill the other is more *dangerous*, as expoſing the Perſon to *ſorer* Death, and more *grievous* Puniſhment; which I take to be *Chryſoſtom*'s real meaning. Nevertheleſs, if a Man only *ſuſpects*, or *doubts* within Himſelf, whether He is fit to receive, it will certainly be his *ſafeſt* way to receive; and his humble Modeſty, if really ſuch, will itſelf be a commendable Part of his *Preparation* [b]. The *Degrees* of unworthineſs are many and various, and no Man is ſtrictly *worthy:* A *ſincere*, tho' for the preſent *weak* Reſolution to amend inſtantly in every known Article of Diſobedience, ſeems to be ordinarily a ſufficient Security againſt the *Danger* of receiving *unworthily*.

Century the Fifth.

THE firſt Council of *Toledo*, in the Year 400, made an Order about thoſe who were obſerved *never to come to Communion*, that They ſhould be *admoniſhed* for ſuch their habitual, and total neglect, and if They did not reform, ſhould be obliged to ſubmit to *Penance* [c]. This De-

[a] 2 *Pet.* II. 21. [b] See *Luke* XVIII. 13, 14.

[c] De his qui intrant in eccleſiam, & deprehenduntur nunquam communicare, admoneantur, ut, ſi non communicant, ad Pœnitentiam accedant, &c. *Concil. Tolet.* I. Can. 13.

cree

cree appears very mild and moderate, as being appointed only againſt thoſe who *conſtantly* abſented, and as preſcribing an *Admonition* before the Cenſure; and at length *excommunicating* Thoſe only, who had in a manner excommunicated Themſelves. No doubt but ſuch Order might have a very good Effect upon Thoſe who were barely *ſupine* and *careleſs* in that Article, otherwiſe leading innocent Lives. But perhaps *Exhortation* or *Admonition* alone might have been ſufficient to as many as were *well diſpoſed*; and as to the reſt, *Cenſure* might be thought too much: For, who ſhall *force* a Man to *repent?* or how is it Repentance, if it is not *free?* Or what ſignifies the coming to the Lord's Table in *Hypocriſy?* Theſe Conſiderations have their weight: And therefore *Excommunication* in ſuch a Caſe, ſo far as it is juſtifiable, muſt be maintained upon ſome *general* Principle, ſuch as the *neceſſity* of removing notorious *Offences* or *Scandals*, for fear of *Contagion* to the reſt, and for fear of bringing an *Infamy* upon the whole Body, by ſuch *Connivance* as might look too like an *Allowance* of ſo ſhameful a Neglect. The *general good* of the Church, in ſome Caſes, ought to over-rule all ſuch Conſiderations as have been before mentioned. For Example: There are, ſuppoſe, ten Thouſand *officiating* Clergy in a Nation, who may be obliged by the Laws of Church and State, to adminiſter and to receive the Holy Communion, ſo often, be they *prepared* or otherwiſe. In ſuch a Number, ſome Hundreds, it may

CHAP. XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

may be, may officiate and receive, not duly *prepared*. Let them look to that: The Church is *clear* ſo far, becauſe the *neceſſity* of the Caſe, and the *general good* ſo requires. It would be trifling here to urge, that it is *forcing* Men to *profane* the Holy Sacrament, or forcing them to *repent* and amend. That muſt be riſked upon higher and more weighty Conſiderations: For, God's People muſt not be deprived of the Benefit of the Sacrament, in ſuch Caſes. Therefore, I obſerved, that the Conſiderations before mentioned *have their weight*; as indeed they ought to have; but ſo far only, as they are not oppoſed to other Conſiderations of a more *general* Nature, and of ſtill greater weight.

THE ſame Council made a ſtrict Order, that ſuch of the reſident *Clergy* as came not to the daily Prayers and Communion, ſhould be depoſed, if They did not reform after Admonition [d]. By this we ſee that *daily Communions* were yet kept up in ſome Churches. Which appears likewiſe from the Teſtimonies of *Jerome* [e], and *Auſtin* [f] of that Time. Some Chriſtians, of that

[d] Clericus, ſi intra Civitatem fuerit, vel in loco quo eccleſia eſt, aut Caſtello, aut vico, aut villa, & ad Eccleſiam ad *Sacrificium quotidianum* non acceſſerit, Clericus non habeatur, ſi caſtigatus per ſatisfactionem veniam ab Epiſcopo noluerit promereri. *Concil. Tolet.* I. Can. 5.

[e] Scio *Romæ* hanc eſſe conſuetudinem ut Fideles *ſemper* Chriſti Corpus accipiant: Quod nec reprehendo, nec laudo; unuſquiſque enim in ſuo ſenſu abundat. *Hieron.* adv. Jovin. p. 239. conf. Ep. 52. ad Lucin. p. 579. Edit. Bened.

[f] Alii *quotidie* communicant Corpori & Sanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt. *Auguſtin.* Epiſt. ad Jan. 54. (alias 118) p. 124. Tom. II. Edit. Bened.

Age,

Age, were ſo ſcrupulous in that matter, that They thought Themſelves under a ſtrict Obligation to communicate, if poſſible, *every Day:* Others thought otherwiſe; and St. *Auſtin* was conſulted upon the Queſtion. It was pleaded on the Side of *daily* Communion, that every one ought to communicate as *often* as He *worthily* might; and that if He was not *debarred* by Church-Cenſures from it, He might be looked upon as *worthy*, the Church being judge of that Caſe. On the other Side it was pleaded, that ſome particular *choſen* Days, when a Man might be moſt *recollected*, and beſt *prepared*, were preferable; for ſo the greater *Reverence* would be ſhewn towards the Sacrament, and it would be more likely to anſwer its end and uſe. St. *Auſtin* did not care to determine for either, but took a middle way to compromiſe the Diſpute; which was to adviſe both Parties (as they intended the ſame Thing in the main) to ſhew their *Reverence* to the Sacrament in their *different* ways, according to their reſpective Perſuaſions. For, ſays He: "Neither of them real-
"ly *diſhonours* the Lord's Body and Blood,
"while both contend, only in a different way,
"who ſhall do moſt Honour to the bleſſed
"Sacrament. For, neither did *Zaccheus* and
"the *Centurion* ſtrive together, or one prefer
"Himſelf before the other, when the former
"gladly *received* our Lord into his Houſe, and
"the latter ſaid, *I am not worthy* that *thou*
"*ſhouldſt come under my Roof:* But both did Ho-
"nour to our Saviour in their *ſeveral*, or rather

CHAP. XVI.

CHAP. XIV.

" *contrary* ways; both were Sinners and both " found Mercy. —— So here, one out of *Re-* " *verence*, dares not partake *every Day*: Ano- " ther out of the like *Reverence*, dares not omit " it a *ſingle* Day: All is well, ſo long as there " is no *contempt* in either Caſe, upon the Holy " Sacrament[g]." This Reſolution of St. *Auſtin* was moſt certainly very wiſe and juſt, ſuitable to the Queſtion as there ſtated, whether a Man ſhould communicate *every Day*, or only upon ſome *ſelect Days*, when fitteſt for it: But had the Queſtion been, whether it were ſufficient for Perſons fitly prepared to communicate *once*, or *twice* a Year, or the like, He would have ſaid *no*, but *oftener*; either *every Month*, or *every Week*, if Opportunity offered. *Gennadius*, who lived in the cloſe of the ſame Century (about *A. D.* 495.) determined as cautiouſly about *daily* receiving, neither approving nor diſapproving it: But *Weekly* receiving He ſpoke fully up to, recommending it as highly proper for all that were competently *prepared*, that is, for all that were ſincerely penitent, and were not under any *prevailing* Inclination to Vice[h].

[g] Neuter enim eorum *exhonorat* Corpus & Sanguinem Domini, ſed ſaluberrimum Sacramentum certatim *honorare* contendunt. Neque enim litigaverunt inter ſe, aut quiſquam eorum ſe Alteri præpoſuit *Zacheus* & ille *Centurio*, cum Alter eorum gaudens in *domum ſuam* ſuſceperit Dominum. Alter dixerit; *non ſum dignus ut intres ſub tectum meum:* Ambo Salvatorem Honorificantes *diverſo*, & quaſi *contrario* modo; ambo peccatis miſeri, ambo miſericordiam conſecuti. —— Ille honorando non audet *quotidie* ſumere; & ille honorando non audet *ullo die* prætermittere. Contemptum ſolum non vult cibus iſte, &c. *Auguſtin.* ibid. p 125.

[h] *Quotidie* Euchariſtiæ Communionem percipere, nec laudo

Century

Century the Sixth. CHAP. XIV.

IN the Beginning of this Century (about A. D. 506.) the Council of *Agde*, in *Gaul*, obliged the *Laity* to receive three Times a Year, at leaſt, at the three great Feſtivals, *Chriſtmas*, *Eaſter*, and *Whitſontide*[i]. It is the firſt Precedent of that kind: And ſome very pious and ſerious Chriſtians have wiſhed, that it never had been ſet, becauſe it might furniſh an Handle to many for imagining that They were under no Obligation to *greater* frequency. But the Council deſigned no ſuch Inference; which at beſt is but a perverſe Conſtruction of the Thing: Only, They conſidered, that to oblige all Perſons to receive *weekly* was impracticable; and to exhort them to *frequency* at large, without ſpecifying any *certain* Times, was doing nothing; and that if ordinary Chriſtians were left to themſelves, they would not, probably, communicate ſo often as *thrice* in the Year, nor *twice*.

nec vitupero: Omnibus tamen *dominicis diebus* communicandum ſuadeo & hortor; ſi tamen mens in affectu peccandi non ſit. Nam habentem adhuc *voluntatem* peccandi, *gravari* magis dico Euchariſtiæ perceptione, quam purificari. Et ideo quamvis quis peccato mordeatur, peccandi non habeat de cætero voluntatem, & communicaturus ſatisfaciat Lacrymis & Orationibus, & confidens de Domini miſeratione, qui peccata piæ confeſſioni donare conſuevit, accedat ad Euchariſtiam intrepidus & ſecurus. Sed hoc de illo dico, quem *Capitalia* & *Mortalia* peccata non gravant. *Gennad. Maſſil.* inter Auguſt. Opp. Tom. VIII. App. p. 78. Ed. Bened.

[i] Seculares, qui *natali Domini*, *Paſcha*, & *Pentecoſten*, non communicaverint, Catholici non credantur, nec inter Catholicos habeantur. *Concil. Agathenſ.* Can. XVIII. p. 1000. *Hard.*

CHAP. XIV.

OTHER Councils, later in the ſame Century, revived the more ancient Rules: The Councils of *Braccara* and *Luca* in *Spain* (A. D. 572.) approved of the Collection of old Canons drawn up by *Martinus Braccarenſis*; among which is the ſecond *Antiochian* Canon, above recited, being the 83d in this Collection [k]. Afterwards, the ſecond Council of *Maſcon* (A. D. 585.) endeavoured to reinforce *weekly* Communions, obliging both Men and Women to communicate every *Lord's Day*, under pain of *Anathema* [l]: Which was ſevere enough, unleſs we may underſtand it only as oppoſed to abſenting in way of *Scorn*, or *Contempt*.

Century the Seventh.

I MAY here take notice, that the Council of *Autun*, in the Year 670 [m], revived the abovementioned *Canon* of the Council of *Agde*, about communicating *three* Times a Year, at the three great Feſtivals. In this Century, the *Greeks* uſed to communicate *weekly*; and ſuch as neglected three Weeks together, were excommunicated:

[k] *It is thus worded:* Si quis intrat Eccleſiam Dei, & Sacras Scripturas audit, & *pro Luxuria ſua* avertit ſe a *Communione* Sacramenti, & in obſervandis myſteriis declinat conſtitutam *Regulam diſciplinæ*, iſtum talem projiciendum de Eccleſia Catholica decernimus &c. Concil. *Braccarenſ.* & *Lucenſ.* Can. 83. Hard. Tom. III. 400.

[l] Decernimus, ut omnibus *Dominicis diebus*, Altaris oblatio ab omnibus *viris* & *mulieribus* offeratur tam Panis quam Vini, ut per has immolationes, & Peccatorum faſcibus careant, & cum *Abel*, vel cæteris juſtis offerentibus promereantur eſſe conſortes. Omnes autem qui definitiones noſtras per Inobedientiam evacuare contendunt, *Anathemate* percellantur. *Concil. Matiſcon.* II. Can. 4. Hard. Tom. III. 461.

[m] *Concil. Auguſtodunenſ.* Can. XIV. Hard. Tom. III. p. 1015.

But

But in the Church of *Rome*, the People were left more to their own Liberty [n]. CHAP. XIV.

Century the Eighth.

VENERABLE *Bede* in his Epiſtle to *Ecgbriht* Archbiſhop of *York*, in the Year 734, has a Paſſage to our Purpoſe, worth the noting. He writes thus: "The Teachers—ſhould inſtruct "the People, how ſalutary *daily Communions* "might be to all kinds of Chriſtians; a Point "which the Church of Chriſt thro' *Italy*, *Gaul*, "*Africa*, *Greece*, and the whole *Eaſt*, have "much laboured, as you well know. This ſo-"lemn Service of Religion, and devout Sanc-"tification to Godward, is ſo far ſunk almoſt "among all the *Laity*, by negligence of their "Teachers, that even thoſe among them who "appear to have a more than ordinary Senſe "of Religion, yet preſume not to partake of "thoſe Holy Myſteries but upon the *Nativity*, "*Epiphany*, and *Eaſter*: Tho' there are innu-"merable Perſons of very innocent and chaſte "Converſation, Boys and Girls, young Men "and Maidens, old Men and Matrons, who "without the leaſt Scruple of Doubt, might "well receive every *Lord's Day*, or over and "above, upon all the Feſtivals, whether of *A-*"*poſtles*, or *Martyrs*; as you have ſeen with "your own *Eyes*, in the Holy, Apoſtolical "Church of *Rome* [o]. FROM

[n] Græci omni Dominica die communicant, ſive Clerici ſive Laici, & qui tribus dominicis non communicaverint, excommunicantur. Romani ſimiliter communicant qui volunt, qui autem noluerint, non excommunicantur. *Theodor. Pœnitential.* p. 46.

[o] ——quam ſalutaris ſit omni Chriſtianorum Generi *quotidiana*

CHAP. XIV.

FROM this remarkable Paragraph, we may obſerve, that even ſo late as the VIIIth Century, *daily* Communions were ſtill kept up, among ſome of the *Clergy* at leaſt; and that all the Chriſtian Churches, or Church-Guides of beſt note, wiſhed to have the like prevail among the *Laity*, and had laboured that Point, as far as they could: But as That was impracticable, Hopes however were conceived, that *weekly* Communions, and more, might yet take place, if due care were taken; and that it was in ſome meaſure owing to the Remiſſneſs of Paſtors, that *Communion* was grown ſo rare and uncommon among the *Laity* of the better Sort; who neglected the Communion, when competently qualified for it, only for want of *Opportunity*, or for want of being *reminded* of it and *exhorted* to it, or elſe out of *Ignorance*, *Supineneſs*, or the like, more than out of any *diſlike* to it, or *unfitneſs* for it: Which may alſo be the Caſe at this very Day.

WHAT has been here offered may be ſuf-

tidiana Dominici Corporis ac Sanguinis Perceptio; juxta quod Eccleſiam Chriſti per *Italiam*, *Galliam*, *Africam*, *Græciam*, ac totum *Orientem* ſolerter agere noſti. Quod videlicet genus Religionis ac Deo devotæ Sanctificationis tam longe a cunctis pene noſtræ Provinciæ *Laicis*, per incuriam docentium, quaſi prope peregrinum abeſt, ut hi qui inter Religioſiores eſſe videntur, non niſi in *Natali* Domini, & *Epiphania*, & *Paſcha* Sacroſanctis myſteriis communicare præſumant; cum ſint innumeri innocentes & caſtiſſimæ Converſationis Pueri & Puellæ, Juvenes & Virgines, Senes & Anus, qui abſque ullo Scrupulo controverſiæ; *omni die Dominico*, ſive etiam in *Natalitiis* Sanctorum *Apoſtolorum*, ſive *Martyrum* (quomodo ipſe in Sancta *Romana* & *Apoſtolica* Eccleſia fieri vidiſti) myſteriis Cœleſtibus communicare valeant. *Bed.* Epiſt. ad *Ecgbert.* p. 311. Edit. Cant.

ficient,

ficient, I conceive, to give a competent Idea of the State of *frequent Communion*, for the firſt *Eight* Centuries: And I need not go lower; except it be to throw in a Word or two of what has been done, as to this Article, ſince the *Reformation*, CHAP. XIV.

THE *Lutherans*, we are told, by one that declares He is *well aſſured* of it[p], do in this Particular, excel all other Proteſtants: For They have a Communion every *Sunday* and *Holiday* throughout the Year. *Calvin* and *Beza*, and the *French* Churches laboured to reſtore *monthly*, or *weekly* Communions; but ſtrictly inſiſted upon *four* Times a Year, under pain of *Contempt*[q]. Our own Church has taken good care about *frequent* Communion, Time after Time[r]. She has been one while charged as doing *too little*, and another while charged as doing *too much*: An Argument that She has competently obſerved the *golden mean*. But in complicated Caſes, where there is no paſſing any certain Judgment, without a large comprehenſive view of a vaſt variety of Circumſtances, it is impoſſible to pleaſe every Body, or even to ſatisfy all the honeſt and well-deſerving. In Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time, Mr. *Cartwright* managed the

[p] *Johnſon*. Unbl. Sacrif. Part II. p. 151. But compare *Calvoer*, a *Lutheran*, who gives but an indifferent Account of the *Number* of their Communicants, being left to their own *Liberty*, and no particular Times ſtrictly inſiſted on. *Calvoer*. de Rit. Eccl. Tom. I. p. 758.

[q] *Bingham*. French Church's Apology. c. xiv.
L'Arroque. Conformity of the *reformed* Churches of *France*. p. 246.

[r] See *Wheatly* on the Common-Prayer. p. 326.

CHAP. XIV.

Charge of *Remiſſneſs* againſt us, in that Article: He would have had the *generality* oblig'd to communicate conſtantly (except in Caſes of *Infirmity*, or *Neceſſity*) under Pain of *Eccleſiaſtical* Cenſure, yea and of *Civil* Penalties[r]. Dr. *Whitgift*, on the other hand, pleaded for *moderate* Counſels, and *convenient* Diſcipline, conſidering the *End* and *Uſe*, and how it might beſt be attained[t].

IT is well known what *Canons* have been ſince made to inforce *frequent* Communion[u]: *Moderate* enough, if compared with *ancient* Canons, or even with thoſe of other *Reformed* Churches. For, no expreſs mention is made of *excommunicating* for neglect, but the Affair is in a great meaſure left to the *prudential* care of the *Dioceſan*, as is juſt and proper. Nevertheleſs, Exceptions have been taken to the Severity of thoſe Canons: And the Charge has been well anſwered by our learned Divines[w], ſo that there is no occaſion now to enter into that Diſpute. However, I am perſuaded, that *Inſtruction* and *Exhortation*, generally, are the beſt and moſt effectual Methods of promoting *frequent* Communion, ſo as to make it anſwer its true *End* and *Uſe*. The moſt *religious* kind of Perſons will of courſe communicate as *often* as

[r] *Cartwright*. Reply to *Whitgift*'s, p. 117. *Reply* to *Whitgift*'s Defence, Part II. p. 148.

[t] *Whitgift*. Defence of his Anſwer to the Admonition, p. 530. &c. Compare *Hooker*. B. V. §. 68. p. 247. Edit. 1723.

[u] Canons of 1603. Can. 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 112.

[w] *Falkner*. Libert. Eccl. B. I. c. v. p. 205, &c.
Sherlock. Defence of Stillingfleet. p. 119.
Bingham. French Church's Apol. B. III. c. 14.

they have opportunity: The *impenitent* or *irreligious* will not *chooſe* to communicate at all; neither is it fit that They ſhould, becauſe, while they continue ſuch, it would do them no good, but harm. There remain only the *ſupine*, *careleſs* and *ignorant*, but *well-diſpoſed*, (ſuch as *Bede*, before cited, ſpake of) who perhaps make up the main Body of Chriſtians: And They are to be dealt with in a tender, engaging manner, either by *Exhortations* from the Pulpit, or by *private* Inſtruction, or by putting good *Books* into their Hands. Much probably might be done, in this way, towards reviving *frequent* Communions, if ſuitable Care and Diligence were uſed in it. But I have ſaid enough on this Article, and it is now time to conclude. I once thought of adding a Chapter upon the *Comportment* proper at, and after receiving the Communion: But theſe Papers are already drawn out into a Length beyond what I at firſt ſuſpected; and I may the more conveniently omit what relates to the *Demeanor* proper at and after receiving, ſince it is well provided for by moſt of the little *Manuals* which are in every one's Hands, and particularly by Biſhop *Taylor*'s *Worthy Communicant*, Chapter the VIIth. CHAP. XIV.

WHAT I have endeavoured all the Way, has been to maintain the dignity of a venerable Sacrament, by the Light of *Reaſon*, *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, againſt unreaſonable Attempts to depreciate or undervalue it. The common methods of *Subverſion* begin with leſſening the Work of *Preparation*, and then go

CHAP. XIV.

go on to ſink the *Benefits:* The next Step, in the Progreſs, is to reduce the whole to a bare *Memorial*, a Memorial of an *abſent* Friend, Maſter, or chief Martyr; paſſing over the *Divine* Perfections of our Lord, and the all-ſufficient *Merits* of what He has done and ſuffered for us. Now, in order to build up again, as others pull down, the Buſineſs of theſe Papers has been to ſhew, that the Sacramental *Memorial* is a Memorial of Chriſt *God-Man*, who died a willing *Sacrifice* for the Sins of Mankind; and that it is not a bare *Memorial*, or *Repreſentation* of ſomething once done and ſuffered, but a real and preſent *Exhibition* of the *Graces*, *Comforts*, or *Bleſſings* accruing therefrom, to every *worthy* Receiver: That therefore proper *Acknowledgments* and *Engagements* are expected from us, and Thoſe require ſuitable *Preparations* and *Qualifications*, and a *Deportment* thereto correſponding; in a word, *Self-Examination*, and *Self-Approbation* beforehand, ſerious Reſolutions of *Amendment* at the Time, and a conſcientious Care afterwards, to perſevere in well-doing to our Lives End.

F I N I S.

A compleat Catelogue of the
Authors Works & when publish'd.

1713. A Sermon preach'd at ye Assizes, Cambridge
1716 Thanksgiving Sermon after Rebell^n Comb
1719 Vindication of ye Divinity, in defense
of some Queries relating to ye Constitution
1720 8 Serm^n in Defence of ye Divin. May^r Lect:
Answer to Dr Whelby's Reply or a
Vindicat^n of ye charge of Falsehood
respecting his Disquisitions Modesty.
1721 The Case of Arian Subscript^n consider'd
An answ^r to some Q^s printed at Lyon
relat^g to Arian Controversy.
Serm^n before ye Sons of ye Clergy.
1722 Supplem^t to ye Case of Arian Subscript^n
Script^l Arians compar'd in their accounts
of God & Christ
1723 2^d Defence of ye Divin of of Queries
Sermon on Prin: & ye true Import of Both
Thanksg: Serm^n before Ld Mayor May 29th
Relig^s Polite: of Children a Serm^n
A Critical Enquiry of ye Athanasian Creed
1724 A farther Vind: of ye Divin. in answ^r to
observat^s on 2^d Defence of some Queries
1730 Remarks on Dr Watts Ch Catechism
The Nature Oblig^n & efficacy of X^n
Sacram^s in Reply to Answ^r to Remarks
a Supplement to ye Nature Obligation
a Defence of [illegible]

1730

731

732

734

735

736

737

738

739

74

1730 Advice to young Student in Univers.
Script. Vindicated part in Answ. to Xty as old as ye Creation: a Preface to 3d Edition

731 Christianity Vindicated agst Infidelity. a charge pt 1st

Scripture Vindicated pt 2d

Christianity Vindicated a charge pt 2

732 Scripture Vindicated &c pt 3d

734 Dissertn on Argumt a Priori, Lett. to Lo

The Importance of Doct. of ye H. Trinit

Discourse on Fundamentals Charge pt 1.

735 Discourse on Fundamls Charge pt 2d.

736 The Doctrinal Use of Xn Sacramts a Charg

737 A Review of ye Doctr: of ye Euchar

738 The Xn Sacrifice Explain'd a Charge

739 The Sacramental part of Euch: Explaind a charge

740 Regeneratn stated & Explaind being substance of 2 Serms at Windsor

Preface to Mr Blairs Serms

The Distinction of Sacrifice Settled a charge

Some Letters on Trinity to Mr Staunton in 1720 published by Staunton. at ye End of Reason & Religion stated in 1722